

6

A N
E X A M I N A T I O N
O F T H E

*Enquiry into the Meaning of
Demoniacs in the New Te-
stament.*

In a Letter to the AUTHOR,

Wherein it is shewn,

That the Word *Demon* does not sig-
nify a Departed Soul, either in the
Classics or the Scriptures;

And consequently,

That the whole of the *Enquiry* is without
Foundation.

Οὐς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, αἰγέλας Μωσῆς
ἔωθεν ὀνομάζειν.

Philo Jud. de Gigant. p. 192. Ed. Turneb.

By SAMUEL PEGGE, M. A.
Vicar of Godmersham in the County of Kent,

L O N D O N,
Printed for FLETCHER GYLES against *Gray's-Inn*
in *Holborn.* MDCCXXXIX.

[Price 1 s. 6 d.]

NOTES ON THE

RECORDS OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

SECRETARY OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

SECRETARY OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

OFFICE OF THE

To the READER.

IN *defending the literal Interpretation of Demoniacs, against the figurative Scheme of the Author of the Enquiry into the Meaning of the DEMONIACS in the New Testament, my Design is not to enter upon a Discussion of the several Cases recorded in the Evangelists, being happily prevented, as to any Attempt of that kind, by the Labours of a much abler Hand, into whose Harvest it would be equally presumptuous and impertinent for me to thrust in my Sickle. But as the learned Author may seem to have left some room for a few further Observations upon the general Argument, it will not be thought improper to examine the Grounds of the Enquiry; neither will Mr. Twells be displeased to see the Foundation of his own excellent Answers establish'd, and his Exposition of each particular Text consequentially enforc'd and maintain'd. It is with this View that I have endeavour'd to canvass the first Principles of the Enquiry, by trying the Medium whereby the Author has thought fit to attack the Catholic Opinion, together with the Justness of his Application thereof to the Scriptures.*

A

The

The Arts of Controversy are what I neither pretend, nor desire to understand: To search out, and afterwards to uphold the Truth, were the sole Motives that induc'd me to appear in this Controversy; and as all partial Proceedings whatsoever ought to be as far remov'd from Researches of this Nature, as possible, I have therein us'd the best of my Judgment, without Artifice: If the Author of the Enquiry is conscious to himself of any sinister Dealings, I am sorry for it.

Foreseeing from the Beginning that the Thread of this Letter was likely to run out into some length, I found myself oblig'd to take Brevity for my Rule, to keep close to my Author, and to avoid, tho' sometimes with Reluctance enough, every Occasion of Excursion; should I be any where thought not to have said enough, the Subject being copious, I desire a due Allowance may be made for this unavoidable Restraint.

My Author in the Preface to the Further Enquiry, after reporting these Words of St. Austin: In the Scriptures we never read of GOOD DEMONS; but WHERESOEVER in them the Name of DEMONS occurs, nothing but EVIL SPIRITS is meant^a, proceeds thus: " St. Austin's Observation is certainly groundless;

^a Nunquam bonos dæmonas legimus: sed ubicunque illarum litterarum [i. e. scripturarum] hoc nomen positum reperitur, sive dæmones, sive dæmonia, dicantur, non nisi maligni significantur spiritus. S. Aug. de Civitat. Dei, lib. ix. c. 19.

“ and yet his Mistake is taken up and espoused
 “ not only by the Author of the Essay in Answer
 “ to the Enquiry, and by Mr. Twells; but
 “ likewise by Dr. Waterland, Dr. Warren,
 “ &c. and then very gravely adds: “ One
 “ cannot but reflect how easily and how fre-
 “ quently Men of Learning fall into this sort
 “ of Errors, without giving themselves the
 “ Time or Trouble to examine the Grounds on
 “ which such Notions are founded.” He asserts
 with an Air of Confidence, and deals his Cen-
 sures very liberally.

Now the Observation has an higher Original than St. Austin; you will find it both in Eusebius^b and Origen^c in express Terms; neither do any other of the Fathers, as far as I can discover, ever hint that the Scriptures any where speak of good Demons. I shall recite the Words of Eusebius, because they want mending, Τα μὲν γὰρ παρ’ ἡμῶν θεῖα λόγια, εἰδ’ ὅ-
 λως ἀγαθὸν οἶδεν ὀνομάζειν δαίμονα, πάντας δὲ πο-
 νηρὰς εἶναι τὴν λέξεως ταύτης, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν προσηγε-
 ρίας μετληχότας, ὡς, &c. and this Reading is followed by his excellent Interpreter Vigerus; but it should be read τὴν λέξεως ταύτης, of this Allotment or Station, by which means you avoid a wretched Tautology.

It was not therefore upon St. Austin’s Authority alone that the Gentlemen above mention’d rely’d, but the Sense of the whole pri-

^b Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. iv. c. 5.

^c Origen contra Cels. p. 234.

mitive Church; neither do I suppose they proceeded solely upon this, but had Recourse at the same time to the divine Original, being so far from not examining, that they examin'd better and more thoroughly than the Enquirer himself did: For as to the Truth of the Case, it will appear sufficiently from the subsequent Letter, that the inspired Authors of the New Testament never use the Word Demon in a good Sense; on the contrary, that they always apply it to evil Beings superior to the Souls of Men, and that their Notion of it grew from the Nature of their Theology, which it was not only entirely consistent with, but even absolutely necessary to. I held it expedient to offer thus much in the Behalf of Truth, but otherwise I presume the Gentlemen under Correction will not find themselves much gall'd with the Stricture, when they consider what Company they are in, Origen, Eusebius, and St. Austin, and that the Author has an Hypothesis to serve: For my part, I am far from wondering at this sanguine Assertion of the Enquirer's, how false soever; but I profess I am greatly surpriz'd with an Annotation of the learned Bishop Fell's upon St. Cyprian's Piece of the Vanity of Idols, which I shall here give you in Dr. Marshal's Words: The Scriptures sometimes use the Word δαίμονες with a bad Meaning, but more generally with a good one; and they express the bad one by δαίμονια. The Difference here suggested betwixt δαίμων and δαίμονιον has no manner of Founda-

Foundation in Scripture, compare MATTH. viii. 31. with LUKE viii. 27. and that Verse of St. LUKE with X 29. and as to the former Part of the Note, I must again rest the Confutation of it upon the Arguments produc'd in the Letter.

I have asserted the Book of Tobit to have been translated into Greek, at or before the Incarnation of our Blessed Saviour, because it was us'd by Polycarp, who was a Disciple of St. John's, and by Clement of Alexandria: I am since confirm'd in my Opinion by finding it so generally known and read in the second Century: Before Irenæus wrote, who flourished somewhat after the Middle of that Age, and had heard Polycarp, the Ophites, and Sethians, Heretics of the Spawn of the Gnostics and Valentinians, ascribed the Prophets Haggai and Tobit to the Angel Elæus: and the Apostolical Constitutions, which are thought to have been first compil'd about the Close of it, quote it in more Places than one: These Testimonies added to those of Polycarp and Clement may seem to put this Point out of Question.

As to the Sense the Hellenistic Jews had affixed to the Word Demon, Philo in his Tract upon Dreams, repeats the Observation he has in his Piece about Giants, concerning the sameness of the Words Angel and Demon, on this wise, Ταύτας δαίμονας μὴ οἱ ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι, ὁ δὲ ἱερός λόγος ἁγέλης εἶπε καλεῖν, προσφυστέρω χρώματος ὀνόματι. and there likewise you
will

will find the Word $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ occurring in that large philosophical Sense I have mention'd.

The Testimony of Josephus is also capable of being urged somewhat further; he tells us that Solomon left behind him several Forms of exorcising Demons: Josephus did not invent this; no, those Forms had been long in use, as is imply'd in these Words: $\text{Καὶ αὐτῇ ΜΕΧΡΙ ΝΥΝ παρ' ἡμῶν ἡ Τεραπεία πλεῖστον ἰσχύει}$. See also MATTH. xii. 27. neither are we to imagine that Josephus was the first that pitch'd upon Solomon for the Author of these Incantations, (nothing of that being intimated in the Text) but rather that it was a receiv'd Opinion amongst the Jews, long before his Time; from all which it follows, that the Notion of Demons being evil Spirits that entered and vexed the Bodies of Men, prevailed currently among the Jews before our Saviour made his Appearance. And, indeed, it appears evidently from the Fragments of the Apocryphal Books of Enoch, which are generally believ'd to have been forg'd before the Coming of Christ, that the Jews were then full of the Notion of fallen or evil Angels, the Egregores mention'd in those Remains being Angels, and expressly so call'd by sundry Authors. See Fabric. Cod. Pseud. Vet. Testam. tom. i. p. 172, 179. and the Alex. MS. GEN. vi. 3. and it is observable, that the Author of the Testaments of the xii Patriarchs, a Work of good Antiquity, thought he adapted himself to the Style and Opinions of the Ancients

cients, when he speaks of the *πνδύμαλα πλά-
νης, πνδύμαλα & Βελίαρ*, and of *δαίμονες πλάνης*.

It were to be wish'd we had more of the Writings of those Jews that compos'd in Greek and flourish'd in that Interval of Time betwixt the framing the LXX Version of the Old Testament, and the giving of the New: For as they all made use of that Version, I make no Question but we should find them, so often as they had any Occasion of treating of such Matters, always applying the Word Demon in the same Sense wherein the New Testament Writers, the Greek Translator of the Book of Tobit and Josephus have done: but alas! we have little more than the Names of some of them; and the Fragments of Ezechiel the Tragedian, Demetrius the Historian, Aristobulus the Peripatetic, &c. which are preserv'd by Clemens, Eusebius, and St. Cyril, afford us nothing upon this Head, and consequently do not supply one Instance of the use of the Word in Question: The same may be said of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament. Had we been able to have produc'd Authorities from any of the Remains of these Authors, it would have wrought more abundant Satisfaction, no doubt; but still we can assuredly acquiesce in what we have, the Greek Version of Tobit, and the Quotations from Josephus being sufficient to convince any unprejudic'd Person of the Acceptation of the Word Demon for an evil Spirit amongst the Greek Jews; especially if it be consider'd, that the Jews
uni-

universally, at that time of day, both believed Possessions to be real, and practis'd Exorcisms, for so it is written by St. MATTHEW, xii. 27. And if I by BEELZEBUB cast out Devils, by whom do YOUR CHILDREN cast them out? therefore they shall be your Judges.

I shall detain you no longer, than just to observe, that since the writing this Letter I have seen two Volumes of a noble Work of Mr. l'Abbé Banier's upon the Mythology and Fables of the Ancients: 'Tis matter of great Satisfaction to find this learned and ingenious Academician concurring in so many essential Points; such as, Homer's adopting the Religious System of the Vulgar, the Traditional Notion of Angels amongst the Ancients, that the Demons were thought an intermediate Order of Beings betwixt Gods and Men; together with Plato's Sentiments thereupon, &c. for all which I refer to the elaborate Author.

April 13, 1739.

S. P.



A N

AN
EXAMINATION
OF THE
*Enquiry into the Meaning of
Demoniacs in the New Te-
stament.*

S I R,

I HAVE perus'd your two *Enquiries* into the Meaning of *Demoniacs* in the New Testament, together with Mr. *Twells's* Answers, and Mr. *Hutchinson's* Sermon on the opposite Side of the Question; and I find, by a late Advertisement in one of the public Papers, that notwithstanding the Representations and Animadversions of these learned Gentlemen, the Controversy is still kept on foot, and, I presume, not without your Knowledge and Approbation. You will not therefore be surpriz'd in finding yourself call'd upon again; but I hope will freely excuse the Liberty I have taken of addressing you, and of desiring you to re-consider with me, the subject matter of your Pieces.

Now I entreat you, in Pursuance of those Declarations wherein you profess yourself an honest Searcher

B

gher

cher after Truth and a sincere Lover of *Jesus Christ* to divest yourself for a while of all Fondness for a favourite Opinion, and to become, as far as you can, an indifferent and an impartial Examiner in this Cause; *impræsentiarum ita tibi informandus est animus, ut libram teneas æquissimi judicis, nec in alteram partem propensus incumbas, ne, non tam ex nostris disputationibus nata sententia, quam ex tuis sensibus prolata videatur*^a.

Every body must own that you have spared no Pains to support and adorn the Cause you have undertaken: Should you therefore find Reason, upon a cool Review, to alter your former Sentiments, you may still retain that, which many a great Man before you has been contented with, namely, the Pleasure and Satisfaction of having made the best of a bad Cause, and of having said every thing that could be said upon the Subject.

Your Scheme is, “ That the ancient *Greeks* “ meant by the Word *Demon* in general, *the Souls* “ *of departed Men*; that they attributed certain “ Diseases to them, namely, such as were attended with violent Distortions, Agitations, or in “ general such Sort of Affections, as could not “ easily be accounted for; but as it is no where “ satisfactorily prov’d, that *the Souls of the deceased* “ *have any Power over Mankind*, the ascribing Diseases to them is only an Hypothesis; “ for the several Deities or Demons, to whom the “ Ancients imputed such Distempers, were only “ the imaginary, and not the real Causes thereof. “ From whence, you think, it follows, that the “ *Demoniacs* of the New Testament being Persons “ labouring under such like Maladies, as the Ancients were wont to ascribe to their *Demons*,

^a Minuc. Felix, c. 5.

“ *Demons* were not the true Causes of those Disorders, but the New Testament Writers made use of the Terms and Language of the Times; and consequently, the several Possessions in the New Testament, when thoroughly consider’d, imply only such Diseases as were usually attributed to *Demons* in those Days, that is, *Epilepsy*, and the various Species of Madness.”

The Method I propose to pursue in trying the Merits of this Figurative Way of Interpretation (which, I trust, has suffer’d no Injury by the foregoing Representation) will be,

First, To examine the Validity of your Observation, “ that the ancient *Greeks* meant by the Word *Demon* in general, the Souls of departed Men.”

Secondly, Whith what Reason and Justice, supposing you to have made good that Point, you apply their Notion of the Word to the Scriptures. And this will lead me,

Thirdly, To evince the true Scriptural Notion of it.

I suppose you will agree with me, that if the new Sense you are pleased to put upon this Word, should prove groundless; or, if in case it were never so clear and certain, yet if the Acceptation you contend for, is not applicable to the Books of the New Testament, then the Conclusion you draw, that by the *Demoniacs* of the New Testament are only intended such Persons, as labour’d under violent Distortions, or Agitations, or such Sort of Affections as could not be accounted for, is entirely without Foundation. There will be no Occasion for me therefore, to produce every particular Text, or to recite the several Cases of the *Demoniacs*; and the less, because I don’t perceive

ceive you any where pretend to say, that the respective Histories are not sufficiently intelligible, or consistently explain'd upon the Footing of the literal received Interpretation; only you take an Exception to the general Doctrine, in following which we are not able, in your Opinion, to give a rational satisfactory Answer to the following Question, to wit, "How it comes to pass that
 "we meet with such an extraordinary Number of
 "Persons under the Power of Devils at the particular Time of our Saviour's Incarnation." This Difficulty was the Motive that induc'd you to make the Enquiry, and therefore I propose for a Conclusion to consider, Whether this Motive alone was sufficient to warrant you in attempting to strike out this unusual Method of Interpretation.

Your first Proposition is, "That the ancient
 "Greeks meant by the Word *Demon* in general,
 "the Souls of departed Men;" an Observation, which, as you build much upon it, ought to be very substantially prov'd.

Now there being nothing in the Original Notion of the Word^b, to support this novel Sense, it is alledg'd that "*Homer* makes *Minerva*, after
 "she had advised *Achilles* to lay aside his Anger
 "against *Agamemnon*, retire to Heaven to the

^b *Plato's* Erymon in *Cratyla*, is, quasi δαίμων; which is follow'd by *Hierocles* in *Aur. Carm. Pythag.* p. 38. Ed. *Needham*. *Hesych.* and the *Etym. M.* *Pofidanius's* in *Macrob. Saturn.* lib. i. c. 23. sive δαίμων ἢ δαίμων, id est καὶ δαίμων: seu αὐτὸ δαίμων, hoc est μετεζομένη; *Quia*, says he, ex aetherea substantia paria atque diversa qualitas illis est. *Proclus* in *Hesiod* derives it, τὸ γὰρ τὰ δαίμονα τὰ πάλιν, ἢ μετὰ τὰ αἰνὰ καὶ ἀνὰ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς. See also the *Schol.* of *Homer*, *H. A.* 222. *Hesych.* and the *Etym. M.* These are Etymologies given by the Heathen themselves, but are not a Jot more applicable to departed Souls, than to Beings of an higher Rank.

“ Palace of *Jupiter to the other Demons, or Gods;*
 “ and who they were is plain, viz. *Apollo, Vulcan,*
 “ &c.” This is indeed your second Argument,
 but I chuse to place it first, because I think it is
 generally allow’d, that *Homer* is the oldest ge-
 nuine *Greek* Writer that has come down to us;
 however he is older than *Hesiod*, whom you seem
 to favour^d. The Force of the Argument is this,
 The ancient Heathen Gods are called *Demons*, who
 having been Men and Women, *Demon* must ne-
 cessarily denote a departed Soul. ’Tis granted the
 Pagan Deities are styled *Demons* both by *Homer*
 and others; nay *Apollo*, as *Laërtius* observes,
 calls himself a *Demon* in his Oracles^e; but it does
 not follow from thence by any Logic, that *Δαίμων*,
 a Word in its own Nature implying no such
 Thing, should import a departed Soul: these mi-
 serable Deities are likewise termed by *Homer*, *ἀθά-
 ναστοι*^f, but surely this Word does not for that
 Reason signify the Souls of dead Men. It will be
 expected, Sir, in this Case, that you should shew
 from good Authority, that the Gods of the Hea-
 then were for that Reason called *Demons*, because
 they were departed Souls; which yet I apprehend
 it will be exceeding difficult to do. For tho’
 perhaps in Fact the principal Deities of the an-
 cient *Greeks* at this Time, now that they had
 foregone the Worship of that older Sett, the Sun,
 Moon, and Stars^g, were but Men and Women
 who had been conversant here upon Earth, and
 afterwards, for their useful Inventions or great
 Exploits were deify’d upon their Deaths, (as is
 constantly insisted upon by the *Christians* in their

^c Enq. p. 3.

^d Enq. p. 2. Further Enq. p. 2.

^e Lib. i. c. 7.

^f H. B. 14. & alibi passim.

^g *Prodicus* apud *Sext. Empiric.* p. 311. & 317. *Plato* in *Cra-
 tylo*, p. 52. Ed. *Bas.*

several *Addresses* to the *Nations*) yet the Heathens themselves were far from regarding them in that Light; as is evident from that *Eubemerus*, *Prodicus*, and *Perseus*, whose Testimonies the Fathers are wont to cite in this Behalf, were esteemed no better than Atheists on the Score of their Writings. Hence Cicero: ^h PERSEUS, the Scholar of ZENO, says, THEY were esteemed Gods, by whose means great Advantage accrued to common Life, by useful Inventions; and that those useful Things themselves had the Names of the several Deities; as if he was not content to say, these were the Inventions of the Gods, but were themselves divine; but what could be more absurd than to honour such sordid mean Things with the Name of Deity, or to place the defunct Sons of Men amongst the Gods, the Worship of whom could only consist in mourning for them? And again, speaking of Prodicus and Eubemerusⁱ, And did not PRODICUS the CEAN, who esteemed those Things as Gods, which were useful to support Life, take away all Religion? And are not They who say that

^h At Persæus, ejusdem Zenonis auditor, eos dicit esse habitos Deos, a quibus magna utilitas ad vitæ cultum esset inventa; ipsasque res utiles & salutare Deorum esse vocabulis nuncupatas: ut ne hoc quidem diceret, illa inventa esse Deorum, sed ipsa divina. Quo quid absurdius, quam aut res sordidas atque deformes Deorum honore adficere, aut homines jam morte delictos reponere in Deos, quorum omnis cultus esset futurus in luctu? *De Nat. Deor. l. i. c. 15.*

ⁱ Quid? Prodicus Ceus, qui ea, quæ prodesse hominum vitæ, Deorum in numero habita esse dixit, quam tandem Religionem reliquit? Quid? qui aut fortis, aut claros, aut potentis viros tradunt post mortem ad Deos pervenisse, eosque esse ipsos quos nos colere, precari, venerarique soleamus, nonne expertes sunt Religionum omnium? quæ Ratio maxime tractata ab Euhemero est, quem noster & interpretatus & secutus est, præter ceteros, Ennius. Ab Euhemero autem & mortes & sepulturæ demonstrantur Deorum. Utrum igitur hic confirmasse Religionem videtur, an penitus totam sustulisse? *Ibid. l. i. c. 42.*

great

great and famous Men became Gods after their Deaths, and are the same whom we worship and pray to, void of all Religion? which Subject is chiefly handled by EUHEMERUS, whom, with others, our ENNIUS has translated and followed. EUHEMERUS has evinced both the DEATHS and SEPULCHRES of the Gods, but does he not seem by this rather to have destroyed Religion, than to have confirm'd it? The Case is very plain as to Euhemerus, who was commonly called an Atheist, as both ^k Clemens Alexandrinus and ^l Sextus Empiricus witness; and I observe that Theophilus Antiochenus both calls him, and proves him one from his Doctrine^m. It should seem the first Christians were charged by the Pagans with Atheism, as well for asserting the Manhood of their Deities, as for refusing to worship themⁿ. I am sensible that some Authors, of a different Character from Euhemerus, speak openly enough of the Origine of their Deities; but who were these? Cicero^o, Pliny^p, Servius^q, and other Latin Authors, who were recent in Comparison of the Times here spoken of, were Men of Letters, and wrote when the World was far advanced in Learning and Philosophy; in ruder Ages, and with the Bulk of Mankind, Matters were far otherwise.

^k Ὡν δὴ χάριν (ὃ γὰρ ἑδαμῶς ἀπεκρυπτόν) θαυμάζειν ἔπεισι μοι, ὅτω τρέπω Εὐήμερον τὸ Ἀκρυσαντῖνον, καὶ Νικάνορα τὸ Κύπελον — ἀθέως ἐπικεκλήκασιν. Clem. Alex. tom. i. p. 20. Ed. Oxon.

^l Εὐήμερος δὲ, ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Ἀθεός, φησὶν Ἦρ. Sext. Empiric. adversus Mathematic. p. 311.

^m Τὰ γὰρ περὶ Εὐμήρου τὸ ἀθεώτατον θεῖον ἡμῖν καὶ λέγουσιν πολλὰ γὰρ περὶ θεῶν τοιμήσας φέγγεσθαι, ἔχαστον καὶ τὸ ἐξόλου μὴ εἶναι θεός, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα αὐτομασίῳ διοικεῖσθαι βέλεται. Theoph. ad Autolyc. lib. iii. p. 210. Edit. Oxon. & vide Sext. Empiric. loco citato.

ⁿ Tatian. Orat. ad Græc. p. 97. Ed. Oxon.

^o Cic. Tusc. i. c. 12.

^p Plin. Nat. Hist. lib. ii. c. 7.

^q Serv. ad Æn. viii. 319.

The

The Poets again, whom the Vulgar chiefly follow'd in Matters of Theology, never presumed to teach that the Gods were but mere Men and Women; the Epithets and Attributes which *Homer* and *Hesiod* are continually bestowing upon them, imply much more, as likewise do all those Passages, wherein they are contradistinguish'd to Mortals. *Longinus* indeed observes, that *Homer* has made Gods of his Men, and Men of his Gods; and *Cicero*, speaking of the Gods eating and drinking, says, ' *This is Homer's Invention, who has carried human Weaknesses into Heaven.* These Reflections are just, as will be seen presently, but they do not prejudice our Assertion, as will then likewise appear.

Thirdly, *Homer*, who is the Person we are here principally concern'd with, did not frame a Theology himself, but follow'd a previously receiv'd System, as both *Monf. Le Clerc* and *Monf. Fraguier* remark. The only Objection to this Opinion is the following Passage of *Herodotus*: *Whence each of the Gods came, whether they all existed always, and what their Dress and Figures were, was not known 'till the other Day, as I may say. HOMER and HESIOD, in my Opinion, liv'd not above four hundred Years ago; and yet these are they who invented the Grecian Theogony, giving the Gods their Names, their Rank, their several Arts, and their Figures. The Poets who are said to have been before these, were AFTER THEM, as I take it.* This is

^r Πιεὶ ὀψύς, § 9.

^s Fingebat hæc *Homerus*, & humana ad Deos transferebat: divina mallem ad nos. *Tusc.* i. c. 26.

^t *Le Clerc* ad *Hesiod.* p. 3. *Monf. Fraguier's* Reflexions, *Mem. de l'Acad. Royale des Inscript. & Belles Lettr.* tom. iv. See also *Feithii Antiq. Homeric.* p. 3.

^v Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐξήκοντο ἔκαστος τῶν θεῶν, εἴτε δ' αὖτε ἦσαν πάντες,

indeed,

indeed very strong, if it be consider'd withal, that the Author was appriz'd both of *Orpheus* and *Musæus* *. But I suppose he look'd upon *Homer* and *Hesiod* as the earliest genuine Writers upon the Subject. I think it evident from the Place last quoted, where he speaks of the male-Practices of *Onomacritus*, the noted Father of those Poems that went under the Name of *Orpheus*, that he regarded the Pieces that bore the Names of *Orpheus* and *Musæus* as spurious; which is the Reason that he here says, *that the Poets, who are said to have been before HOMER and HESIOD, were AFTER THEM, as he took it.* It cannot be imagin'd, that he thought the real *Orpheus* and *Musæus* more recent than *Homer*; it must be those Works of theirs which were handed about and generally reputed more ancient than the Compositions of *Homer* and *Hesiod*, that he is speaking of: And thus esteeming *Homer* and *Hesiod* the oldest authentic Theogonists, he concluded too hastily from thence, that the *Greeks* were without a Theology 'till they started up; which cannot be true, as is evident from the Conformity observable in *Homer* and *Hesiod*, which cannot possibly be accounted for upon that Supposition. From *Homer* then we learn the Opinions both of the more ancient and the later Pagans, and may justly infer further that he neither coined the Word *Demon*, nor first apply'd it to the Heathen Dei-

οκοῖοι τέ τινες τὰ εἶδα, ἐπεὶ ἐπιστάτο μέγιστα ὅτι πρὶν τε καὶ χθρὶς, ὡς εἶπεν Ἰγνῶ. Ἡρόδοτος δὲ καὶ Ὀμηροῦ ἡλικίῳ τετρακοσίοισι ἐτεσὶ δοκίω μὲν προσούλεως ἡλιάδ, καὶ ἡ πλείοσι. Οὗτοι δὲ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι, καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες, καὶ τιμὰς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες, καὶ εἶδα αὐτῶν σημανταί: οἱ δὲ πρότερον ποιήσαι λεγόμενοι τῶν αὐτῶν ἡλιάδ, ὅτε οἱ, ἡμῶν γὰρ δοκίω, ἐχρῆτο τῶν. Herodot. l. ii. c. 53.

* See Book ii. c. 81. & vii. c. 6.

ties, but that from remoter Ages it was given to the *Dii majorum Gentium*. *Hesiod* has the Word as well as he, and it is plain he borrow'd it not from him, for his *Demons* are different from *Homer's*. This will lead one to think that this Tribe of Deities were first admitted upon the Footing of those imperfect Notions the World then had of those intermediate Beings the *Angels*, who were generally understood to be of both Sorts, both Good and Bad. The *Demons* of *Homer* and *Hesiod*, and consequently those of the more ancient Pagans, were a Ministerial Order of Beings, acting under the *Father of Gods of Men*, and were both Good and Bad, as will appear in its proper Place. *Plutarch*, a Man of as extensive Knowledge as any amongst the Ancients, reckons this Notion of *Demons*, a very ancient Doctrine, carrying it up as high as *Zoroaster*; *They seem to me*, says he, *to have solved great and difficult Doubts, who have PLACED THE DEMONS BETWEEN THE GODS AND MEN, and found out what in some Sort uniteth and joineth us with them: Whether this be the Doctrine of the MAGI and ZOROASTER, or the THRACIAN Doctrine derived from ORPHEUS, or the ÆGYPTIAN, or PHRYGIAN^y, &c.* it was a very old Tradition, and the most learned knew not whence they had it. *Philo* writes, ^z *Those whom the other Philosophers call DEMONS, MOSES is wont to term ANGELS,*

^y Εμοὶ δὲ δοκῶσι πλείονας λῦσαι καὶ μείζονας ἀπείρας οἱ τὰ δαιμόνων ἡρώς ἐν μέσῳ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τρέποντι τινὰ τὴν κοινω-
νίαν ἡμῶν συνάγοντες εἰς ταῦτα καὶ συνάπτοντες ἐξ ἀρετῆς· ἢτε Μάγων
ἢ τε περὶ Ζωροάστρου ὁ λόγος ἢ τίς ἐστιν, ἢτε Θρακίῳ ἀπ' Ὀρ-
φείως, ἢ τ' Αἰγυπτίῳ, ἢ Φρυγίῳ, &c. *Plutarch. de Def. Orac.*
& in *Vita Dionis*.

^z *Philo de Gigantibus*, p. 192. Ed. *Turneb.* Οὗς ἄλλοι φιλό-
σοφοι δαίμονας, ἁγίους Μωσῆς εἶπεν ὀνομάζειν.

as if one and the same Rank of Creatures were intended by those two Words: And so *Celsus* in *Origen*^a, *No God, O ye Jews and Christians, nor Son of God ever came down amongst us, or could come down; if ye mean Angels, who were these? Gods, or some other Order? Another Order, I suppose, namely DEMONS.* In another Place he expressly distinguishes the *Demons* from *dead Men*.^b It would be tedious to accumulate Quotations and Testimonies of this Sort^c. These may suffice, being very clear for the Cause and Origin of the Gentile Polytheism, as likewise for the Reason of *Homer* and *Hesiod*'s giving this Name to the several Objects thereof.

I would ask you, after what has been said, whether you suppose, or can hope to convince any intelligent Reader, that, when *Apollo* calls himself a *Demon* in his Oracles, or, if you will, when the Priestess calls him so, it is intended to signify to us, that he was a *departed Soul*? Or that *Homer*, when he calls the Gods *Demons*, meant to say, they were only *dead Men*? That, for Instance, when the Plague was brought upon the *Grecian Army* by *Apollo*, the Inflictor was understood both by himself and his Readers, to be *but the Soul of a Man*? The Antients, at this Time of Day, whatever they did afterwards, did not believe the Souls of dead Men, as such, had any Power over the Liv-

^a Θεὸς μὲν, ὃ Ἰηδοῦναι καὶ Χερσικῶν καὶ θεῶν παῖς εἰδὲς κατήλθεν, ὅτε κατέλθοι· εἰ δὲ τίνος ἀγγέλος φατέ, τίνος τέτυκας λέγει, θεός, ἢ ἄλλο τι ἦν; ἄλλο τι, ὡς εἰκός, τὸς δαίμονας. *Origen contra Cels.* l. v. p. 232. See also p. 233. Lib. vii. p. 376.

^b Ὅτι μὲν ἐν αὐτοῖς διελέχοντο σαφῶς ὃ θεὸν, ἀλλ' εἰδὲ δαίμονας, ἀλλὰ νεκρὸν ζῶοντες. *Origen contra Cels.* l. vii. p. 376. And in another Place he calls them, Σαλγόπας ἔ' ἐπὶ παῶσι θεῶ, καὶ ὑπάρχοντες, καὶ ἑσπέρωντες, καὶ ἐπιλόγους. Lib. viii. p. 400.

^c See Mr. Mede's Works, Ed. 1677. p. 627. and Mr. Hutchinson's Sermon. *Havercamp ad Tertullian.* c. xlv.

ing, so as to bring Diseases upon them; on the contrary, *Feithius* will inform you, that they were thought to stand in need of the Living^d.

The Observation you have concerning the *Generation* of these Deities,^e and the Pages spent in discovering "who the old Gods of the Heathen" were, and for what they were deified,"^f will not help you in this Case. For tho' we have authentic Relations, not only of the Descent, but also of the Lives and Actions of these reputed Gods; yet this will not lead us to the Discovery of the true Sense and Meaning of the Word *Demon*. The Gods and Goddesses were Men and Women no doubt, but then they who gave them the Name of *Demons*, did not esteem them as such when they imposed it, neither did they mean to convey to us any such Notion by that Term. We know the Generation and the Transactions of these Deities, therefore they were Men and Women: The Reasoning is just, and is urged with great Force and Pertinence upon the Pagans by the Fathers of the Church, and at last had the desired Effect; but you cannot argue from thence to the Word *Demon*, any more than you can to the Word *Θεός*; it would be very absurd to say, the Gods of the Heathen were Men, therefore the Word *Θεός* means the Soul of a Man. The Business is, 'till the Light of the Gospel began to dawn upon them, and their Eyes were in a Manner forced open by the Brightness of its Beams, the Antients never could discern the manifest Absurdity of their Theology, notwithstanding the Pretences of the *Cretans* to the Grave of *Jupiter*, who were only reckon'd Liars for their Pains^g, or the Works of *Eubemerus* and the

^d *Feithii* Antiq. Hom. lib. i. c. 15.

^e Enq. p. 4. ^f Further Enq. p. 15. seq.

^g *Callimach.* Hymn. in *Jov.* v. 7. & adnotat.

rest of that Class. The Vulgar were always bad Divines, and the Poets, who took up their System, and were afterwards in their Turn follow'd by them, were no better. *Θεογονία* was not thought a Contradiction in Terms by them^b, nor *Θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι* by the Philosophersⁱ. The Poets only established and sanctified the Errors of the Multitude; and *Homer* himself, who so deservedly claims the first Place amongst the Poets, must be content to be ranked with the worst of Theologers. Thinking Men, tho' the Vulgar did not, could easily discover his Fault in this Respect; not only *Lucian*, but *Pythagoras* and *Plato*^k, *Cicero* and *Longinus*^l, together with all those who attempted to allegorize his Divinity. Now the Reason of this Conduct in this Prince of Poets is obvious enough; the Gods were necessary to his Plan, giving it both Ornament and Magnificence; he was glad to introduce them for that Reason; but then he could not alter them, but must take them as he found them: And as they had really been Men and Women, whose Histories and Transactions were well known, and even their Descents, the Vulgar still continued celebrating their Actions, and attributing to them the same good Qualities, whatever they were, after their *Apotheosis*; and thus it came to pass, that their Humanity adhered to them; but then, they were no longer regarded as Men;

^b *Orpheus* either writ a *Theogony*, or one was very early father'd upon him. *Hesiod's* is now extant; and thus *Homer*, Il. E. 201.

ἄλλοι δὲ τῶν θεῶν ἄνθρωποι καὶ μὲν τῶν τιμῶν.

ⁱ *Plato* in *Timaeo*.

^k *Pythagoras* said he was punished in *Tartarus* for the many unbecoming Things he had reported of the Gods. *Diog. Laert. Vit. Pyth.* p. 505. Ed. *Meib.* *Plato* banish'd him from his Commonwealth for the same Reason.

^l *Cic. Tusc. i. c. 26.* *Longinus* *περὶ ὑψηλῶν* § 9.

they were Gods now, even with all their Imperfections. Such a Proceeding must necessarily fill their Theology with infinite and shameful Inconsistencies; but still they never perceiv'd it, neither was it in the Power of their Poets to help it; the Running of a few Years serv'd to conciliate a lasting Veneration for such beneficent extraordinary Personages, and to fix a Belief in them, who were already possess'd of a Notion of a subordinate Rank of celestial Beings, that they were elevated into that Class, and were really become *Demons*. The Facility of the after Ages in swallowing such Grossnesses in their Religious System, perhaps might be owing in some Measure to a Persuasion, that there was a Time when the Gods had frequent and most familiar Commerce with Mankind, even so as to be imagin'd upon that Account to have inhabited the Earth along with them, in like Manner as the Sylvan Gods, the *Fauns*, *Nymphs*, and *Satyrs* were believ'd afterwards to do^m; or that Earth and Heaven at that Time were both but one Kingdom. There are strong Traces of both these Opinions, amongst the Ancients, especially the Poets, who were the Fathers of their Mythology. *Hesiod* himself insinuates, that the Gods and first Men were born and liv'd togetherⁿ, and so does *Virgil*^o, and

^m Sunt mihi Semidei, sunt Rustica Numina Nymphæ,
Faunique, Satyrique, & monticolæ Sylvani:
Quos quoniam Cœli nondum dignamur honore,
Quas dedimus, certe Terras habitare sinamus.

Ovid. Metam. I. 192.

ⁿ Ὡς ὁμοῦθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ, θνητοὶ τ' ἀνθρώποι.

Hesiod. Eeg. & Hæc. γ. 109.

^o Ille Deum vitam accipiet, Divisque videbit
Permixtos Heroas, & ipse videbitur illis.

Virg. Eclog. IV. 15.

Seneca^p. It was suppos'd the Gods remov'd from Earth to Heaven, when Men began to be wicked: *Hesiod* writes that *Pudor* and *Nemesis* were the last that went away, they not departing 'till the fifth Age^q; *Ovid* delivers much the same of *Astræa* in the Iron Age^r. See also *Virg.* Eclog. IV. 6. *Georg.* II. 473. and *Aratus* p. 19. Ed. Oxon.

As to the Government of the Gods, *Saturn* not only reign'd in Heaven in the Golden Age, as *Hesiod* has it, but on Earth too, if we may believe *Virgil*^s; *Cæcilius* in *Minucius Felix* assents to this: To believe the Ancients, who in the Infancy of the World were so highly favour'd, as to have the Gods either for their Benefactors or Governors^t: So I render this Passage, rather than follow Mr. Reeves, who gives it thus, To pin our Faith upon our Forefathers, who in the Times of Simplicity and Infancy of the World, DID USE TO MAKE GODS, EITHER OF PUBLIC BENEFACTORS OR OF KINGS. *Cæcilius* has the Part of the Pagan in the Dialogue, and never would have admitted that; his Antagonist *Octavius* afterwards urges it upon him: Our Ancestors, while they religiously honour their KINGS, while they desire after their Departure to behold them

^p ————— Hoc equidem reor

Vixisse ritu, prima quos mixtos Deis,

Profudit ætas. ————— *Senec.* Hippolyt. § 525.

^q *Hesiod.* 'Egy. & 'Hæz. § 197.

^r *Ovid.* Metam. I. 149.

^s Primus ab Æthereo venit Saturnus Olympo,
Arma Jovis fugiens, & regnis exul adeptis.
Is genus indocile, ac dispersum montibus altis
Composuit, legesque dedit, Latiumque vocari
Maluit, his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris.
Aurea quæ perhibent, illo sub Rege fuerunt
Sæcula; sic placidâ populos in pace regebat.

Virg. Æn. VIII. § 319. seq.

^t Prioribus credere, qui in ipsius mundi Natalibus, meruerunt Deos vel faciles habere, vel reges. *Min. Felix.* c. v.

in their Images, and delight to preserve their Images in Statues; what was at first taken up for their own Solace, was at length made a Matter of Religion, &c. I refer for further Satisfaction on this Head, to *Dan. Heinsius's* Introduction to *Hesiod's* *Egy. & Hæg. cap. ix.* and *Mr. Shuckford's* Connexion of Sacred and Profane History, vol. i. p. 28.

Others again would content themselves with this enormous Fabric of Superstition, merely because it was consecrated by its Antiquity; they would not reject nor even examine it, because it had served their Ancestors, and was handed down, as a sacred *Depositum* from them. *Cæcilius* harangues upon this, in the Chapter just now cited, and *Justin Martyr* begins his Parænetical Oration with an Endeavour to remove this unreasonable Prejudice, and you will find *Clemens Alexandrinus* arguing against it in his*.

But after all, the Blindness and Infatuation of the Ancients was so great and deplorable in this Article, especially amongst the *Egyptians*, some of whose Deities grew in their Gardens, that in my humble Opinion it must be resolv'd into somewhat higher than mere natural Causes.

Another Argument which you bring in Proof of your Assertion, "That the ancient *Greeks* meant by the Word *Demon* in general, the Souls of departed Men," runs thus, "*Hesiod* tells us,

† Dum reges suos colunt religiose, dum defunctos eos desiderant in imaginibus videre, dum gestiunt eorum memorias in statuis detinere, sacra facta sunt, quæ fuerant assumpta solatia; denique & antequam commercii orbis pateret, & antequam gentes ritus suos moresque miscerent, unaquæque natio conditorum suum, aut ducem inelytam, aut reginam pudicam sexu suo fortiolem, aut alicujus muneris vel artis repertorem venerabatur, ut civem bonæ memoriæ: sic & defunctis præmium & futuris dabatur exemplum. *Mimic. Felix, c. xx.*

* *Clem. Alex. tom. i. p. 57. seq.*

† *Juvenal Sat. xv.*

" that

“ that in the “ Golden Age^z, when *Saturn* reign-
 “ ed in Heaven, Men lived like Gods, free from
 “ Evils, and died just as if they had fallen asleep;
 “ These were made *Demons*, good Beings, the
 “ Guards of mortal Men; they observe the Good
 “ and Evil done here; and cloathed with Air,
 “ they are every where on Earth, numberless,”
 “ &c. These were good Beings, and the Authors
 “ of Good to Mankind. The *Souls* of these Men,
 “ after they were remov’d from this earthly Life,
 “ were made the Inspectors of human Affairs,
 “ and as they *dispensed* good Things to Men, they
 “ were called *Demons*.^a” You seem very willing
 to say, that the *Demons* of the ancient *Greeks* were
 originally all good Beings^b; but I observe you are
 under some Confusion in this Matter; in the Fur-
 ther Enquiry^c, you tell us the *Grecians* had their
 Notion of *Demons* from the *Ægyptians*, who held
 an *evil Demon*, as well as a good one; but yet you
 there assert, “ That at first the *Greeks* knew of
 “ no other than good *Demons*.” So here you col-
 lect that *Hesiod*’s *Demons* were good Beings; but in
 the Further Enquiry, p. 3. you own *Hesiod* uses
 δαίμονιν in a bad Sense; and you there confess the

^z Ως ὁμόθεν γεγάασαι θεοί, θνητοί τ’ ἄνθρωποι,
 χρύσειον μὲν πρῶτις αἰὼν μέσσω ἀνθρώπων
 ἀθάνατοι ποίησαν ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχοντες.
 οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ χρόνῳ ἦσαν, ὅτ’ ἔρηνω ἰμβασίλῳ.

when this Race died,

τοὶ μὲν δαίμονες εἰσι, διὸς μεγάλα δῖα βελάς,
 ἑσθλοί, ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
 οἳ ἔα φυλάσσειν τε δίκας καὶ χεῖρτι ἔργα,
 ἥρας ἰσάμενοι, πάντῃ φοιτῶντες ἐπ’ αἶαν,
 Πλευρόδοι· καὶ τῷτο γέρας βασιλῆϊον ἔχον.

Again, Τεῖς γὰρ μύθοι εἰσὶν, ἐπὶ χθονὶ πελοποδείῃ
 ἀθάνατοι Ζήνους, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, &c.

Hesiod. Erg. & Hæm. 109. seq.

^a Enq. p. 2.

^b Further Enq. p. 2, 3, 15, 19, 41.

^c Pag. 41.

same of *Homer*: As to *Homer* the Case is plain enough^d; indeed you say that “κακὸς δαίμων in “Him is not an *evil Spirit*, or a *Devil*, as we understand that Word; but an *adverse Demon*, one “that was the Cause of Misfortunes, or that hindered Success to some Men^e.” It is not supposed that the Poet had exactly the same Idea of an *evil Spirit* that we now have; but it is evident he thought some *Demons* were the Authors of Vexation and Trouble, and inflicted Diseases upon Mankind, and whose Business and Employment it was to do such Things, which is enough for me. As to others, *Pythagoras* and *Ocellus Lucanus*^f both acknowledged *evil Demons*, and *Empedocles* does the same in *Plutarch*^g; as also does *Zaleucus* in *Stobæus*. People will be apt to think *Origen* a very good Judge in this Matter, even though your Opinion lyes in the opposite Scale, *Not only we Christians say the DEMONS are EVIL, but almost all others who hold such Beings*, says he^h, and the common People in *Philo’s* Time talk’d as currently of *evil Demons* as they did of *good ones*ⁱ; *Homer*,

^d “Ὡς δ’ ὅταν ἀπάσι βίῳ παίδεσι φανείη
Πατὴρ, ὅς ἐν νύτῳ κῆται κράτερ’ ἄλγεα πάχων,
Διὸν τηρόμεν, (συγερός δέ οἱ ἔχρε δαίμων) &c.

Homer, Odyss. E. 394.

Πῶς ἦλθες, Ὀδυσσεῦ; τίς τοι κακὸς ἔχρε δαίμων;

Ibid. K. 64.

κακὸς δαίμων is the same as συγερός δαίμων. Of this Sort were *Εριπνός* and *Ἄτη*, ἡ πάντας αἶπται, and whom *Jupiter* threw headlong out of Heaven, *Il. T. 126.* and see *Just. Mart. Parænetic. p. 109. Ed. Oxon.* When Men became obnoxious to the Gods, they fell into the Hands of such *Demons* as these, *Odyss. K. 73.*

^e Further Enquiry, p. 3. ^f See below.

^g *Plutarch. περὶ ἀθυρίας. p. 474. Ed. Par.*

^h Φαῦλος ὁ δαίμονας, ὃς μόνοι λέγονται ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ χεδὸν πάντες, ὅσοι δαίμονας τιθέασιν ἑῷ. *Orig. c. Cels. lib. viii. p. 377.*

ⁱ Ὡστερ ὁ ἀγαθὸς δαίμονας καὶ κακὸς λέγουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ ψυχὰς ὁμοίως, ἕτω καὶ ἀγγέλους. *Philo de Gigantibus, p. 192.*

uses

uses ὁλοδοαίμων, and *Hesiod* δ'δαίμων, which shews it is an indifferent Word, susceptible both of a good and a bad Sense. See *Hesychius* v. δαίμονιε, and *Etym. M.* v. δαίμονι &c. You observe that all *Plato's Demons* are good Beings^k, but it must certainly be an *evil Demon* that mixed a present Pleasure with Evil^l: *Plato* had this Notion of an *evil Demon* from the *Pythagoreans*^m. But to go upon *Hesiod*; he, it seems, as well as *Homer*, held *Demons*; but he thought they were different from *Minerva*, *Apollo*, &c. and were the Men of the Golden Age: This therefore is his Method of accounting for those subaltern Beings which he met with in the Theology of the Vulgar; a Method peculiar to himself; for I think no extant Author since him, though many have taken Occasion to mention the Golden Ageⁿ, have ever asserted that the Men thereof became *Demons*; (as to *Plato*, it will appear, when we come down to him, that he speaks not his own, but *Hesiod's* Sentiments;) the Reason was, that though they believ'd and deliver'd many incoherent ridiculous Things concerning their Gods, yet they never could bring themselves to say that the Objects of their Worship were θνητοὶ ἄνθρωποι, mortal Men. *Oenomaus* therefore in *Eusebius* rightly calls them Ὑσιοδεῖοι Θεοί. *Hesiod* being then singular in this Point, it may be proper to enquire what could lead ~~them~~ into this Notion. Now I look upon the Golden Age as a mere Invention of his^o; but after

^k Further Enquiry, p. 15, 19.

^l Ἔστι μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα κακά· ἀλλὰ τίς ἔμιξε δαίμων τοῖς πλείστοις ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμικῷ ἡδονῷ, οἷον κόλακι δεινῷ θηρίῳ καὶ βλάβῃ μεγάλῃ, ὅπως ἐπέμιξεν ἡ φύσις ἡδονῷ τινα σὺν ἁμύσσει. *Plato* in *Phad.* p. 200. See *Clem. Alex.* tom. ii. p. 702.

^m See below.

ⁿ *Aratus*, *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Seneca*, *Juvenal*, &c.

^o *Le Clerc* ad *Hesiodi Theogon.* § 211.

he had thought fit to introduce this, there was no other way for him to dispose of these Men; it was the *Golden Age*, when *Saturn* reign'd, when as yet there were no *Inferi*^p. The Brothers *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and *Pluto* had not yet divided the Universe; and as there was no Place of Punishment, there was no *Elysium*. And thus it was, that the Poet not knowing where to place the Souls of these Persons, and not troubling himself about the Expression *Θνητοὶ ἄνθρωποι*, *mortal Men*, or, as I rather think, not perceiving the Inconsistency of that with the Canonization of this Race of Men, adventur'd to make *Demons* of them. We will now consider how far the Sense of the Word *Demon* can be gather'd from this notable Passage. The Men of the Golden Age became *Demons*; but how was that? as having been Men, so that the Word *Demon* shall signify the Soul of a Man? By no means; it was by the Will of the great *Jupiter*^q; in like manner as *Plato* speaks of his created Gods, where he introduces the Creator addressing them thus, *Wherefore, since ye have had a Beginning, ye are not immortal nor absolutely indissoluble, but nevertheless you shall not be dissolv'd, nor taste of Death, THROUGH MY WILL, which is more powerful than that Law by which you began to be*. The Heathen in *Tertullian's* Time preten-

P ——— nondum aliquis sortitus triste profundi
Imperium, aut Sicula torvus cum conjuge Pluton.
Nec rota, nec Furia, nec saxum, aut vulturis attri
Pœna, sed infernis hilares sine Regibus umbræ.

Juvenal, Sat. xiii. 49. seq.

q Ταὶ δὲ δαίμονες εἰσι, Διὸς μεγάλης ἄλγε' βουλᾶς.

Hesiod. *Æg.* & *Hom.* ὡ 122.

ῥ Δι' αὖ καὶ ἐκείνους γενήσεται, ἀθάνατοι μὲν σὺν ἐστὶ, εἰδ' ἀνθρώπων
τοπάμπαν, ὅτι μὲν δὴ λυθήσονται γῆ, εἰδὲ τούτων θανάτου μοίρας.
ῥ ἰμὴς βυλῆσι καὶ μείζοντι ἔτι δισμῶ καὶ κυβελίῃ λαχόντες οὐρανῶν,
οἷς ὅτ' ἰγύνεται *Cyclopes*. *Plato in Timæo*, p. 481. Ed. Bas.

ded that Men might become Gods, *And because you have not the Hardiness to deny but that your Gods were once Men, but yet stand up for their being turned into Gods, I shall now consider the Reasons for such a Persuasion.* When they were pinch'd with the Testimonies the *Christians* alledg'd in Proof of their Gods being Mortals, this it seems was their usual Refuge; they said, 'the conferring of Godships was intended for the rewarding of Virtue. The Men of this Age, according to *Hesiod*, were very good, and were rewarded for their Goodness by being advanced upon their Deaths to the Order and Dignity of *Demons*; the *Demonship* was the Reward of their Virtue, and when they are called *Demons*, it is not in respect of what they had been, but what they now were, ἀθάνατοι Ζηῶδες, φύλακες θνήτων ἀνθρώπων*, the *Immortals of Jupiter*, and the *Guardians of mortal Men*. I presume the *Heroes*, *Bacchus*, *Hercules*, &c. were not esteem'd by their Worshippers after their *Immortalization*, as the Souls of mere dead Men, but as elevated by the Favour of the supreme *Jupiter*, to a Rank of Godship, in Consequence, and upon the Account of their extraordinary Virtue. This Interpretation is entirely agreeable to *Proclus*,

* Et quoniam sicut homines fuisse non audetis negare, ita post mortem Deos factos instituistis asseverare, causas quæ hoc exegerint, retractemus. *Tertull. Apolog. c. xi.*

† Respondentes collationem divinitatis meritorum remunerandorum fuisse rationem. *Ibid.*

‡ 'Tis term'd by the Poet *regius honor, regia dignitas*, † 126. which, as *Grevius* observes from *Plutarch*, was because it was βασιλικόν τι εὖ ποιεῖν; this shews us what *Macrobius* means when in his Commentary on *Scipio's Dream*, l. i. c. 9. he calls the Men of this Age *priscos Reges*.

* *Hesiod. Epy. & Huse. † 253.*

‡ Hac arte Pollux & vagus Hercules
Enisus arces attigit igneas.

Hor. Od. iii. 3.

whose

whose Words are, Τὰς μεθισταμένους τῷ ζῳῷ, ὅντας ἢ φύλακας τῷ βίῃ τῶ ἀνθρώπων, δαίμονας καλεῖ; the Sense of which Annotation is not, as is suggested by you^z, that he calls them *Demons*, because they were remov'd from this Life, but because they were φύλακες τῷ βίῃ τῶ ἀνθρώπων, the Guardians of mortal Men; the Particle ἢ subjoined to the Participle of the Verb Substantive, evidently shews this to be the Cause of it, which agrees both with the Words of the Poet^a, and with his own Etymon^b. The Scholiast of *Homer* concurs; he says *Hesiod* calls those *Demons* who were remov'd from this Life, but not in general, or for that Reason, but that particular Set of Men who lived in the Golden Age, and were made the Guardians of mortal Men, which are *Hesiod*'s Words, the Words whereon he grounds his Observation^c.

So far you are pleas'd to go with the Poets; to whom you add *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and *Josephus*, the Consideration of whose Testimonies, if you will give me leave, I would reserve, without Detriment to the Enquiry, for a properer Place. I pass on to the Further Enquiry, where you introduce the Philosophers *Thales*, *Pythagoras*, and *Plato*: “*THALES's* Notion concerning DEMONS, you say, was, that the World^d was full of them. It is observ'd of him, that he first taught that Souls were immortal^e. *Plutarch* tells us, that *Thales's* Notion was, that *Demons*

^z Enq. p. 3.

^a φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^b Παρὰ τὸ δαλῦναι τὰ πᾶντα, ἢ μερίζειν τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰ κακὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

^c Ἡσιόδῳ ἢ δαίμονας φησι, τὰς ἐν τῷ ζῳῷ μεταστάτας, ὅντας ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ χρόνῳ βασιλείας, ἢ χροσθ' ἡέως, λίγων αὐτὰς δαίμονας φύλακας θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Schol. Brev. Hom. Il. A. 222.*

^d Τὸν κόσμον ἑμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη. *Laert. Thales.*

^e Αὐτὸν πρῶτον εἰπεῖν φασιν ἀθανάτους τὰς ψυχάς, *Ibid.*

“^f were *spiritual Subsistencies*; and *Heroes, Souls*
 “ *separated from Bodies*. He had a Notion that
 “ all the World was *animated*, or had a Soul; and
 “ that the Soul was that which caused Motion;
 “ he therefore imagined a *Loadstone* ^g to have a
 “ Soul, because it *attracted or moved Iron*. I think
 “ it hard to say what he meant by the Worlds
 “ being animated. *Aristotle* thinks that he meant
 “ that a Soul was *mixed* ^h with or pervaded the U-
 “ niverse, from whence, perhaps, he thought all
 “ Things to be full of Gods. There seems to be no
 “ Difference in saying that the World was full of
 “ Demons, and that it was full of Gods.” It ap-
 pears from your own Account of the matter, that
Thales regarded the Demons as spiritual Substances,
 distinct from human Souls; for he distinguishes
 them from the *Heroes*, whom he deemed to be
Souls separated from Bodies; it is plain again, that
 if there be no Difference in saying that the World
 was full of *Demons*, and that it was full of *Gods*,
 that *Demons* and *Gods* were synonymous Words
 with him, and consequently the former could not
 be the Souls of Men. Let us hear *Pythagoras*:
 “ Cotemporary many Years with *Thales* was *Py-*
 “ *thagoras*, who had much the same Notions with
 “ him, only he appropriated to the *Air*, what the
 “ other said of the *World*: He taught, “ that
 “ the *Air* ⁱ was full of Souls, and that these were

^f Δαίμονας ὑπάρχειν ὅσας ψυχικάς, καὶ Ἡρώας τὰς κεχωρισ-
 μένους ψυχὰς ἢ Σωμάτων. *Plut. de Placit. Philos. l. i. c. 8.*

^g Ἔοικε καὶ Θαλῆς — κινητικόν τι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπολαμβάνειν, εἴπερ
 τὸν λίθον ἔφη ψυχὴν ἔχειν, ὅτι τὸν σίδηρον κινεῖ. *Arist. de Anima,*
l. i. c. 2.

^h Ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ δέ τινες αὐτὴν [ψυχὴν] μεμίχθαι φασιν· ὅθεν ἴσως
 καὶ Θαλῆς ὥσπερ πάντα πλήρη θεῶν ἔη. *Ibid. c. 8.*

ⁱ Εἶναι πάντα τὸν αἶρα ψυχῶν ἔμπλεον καὶ τάτῃς τῆς δαίμονας
 τε καὶ Ἡρώας νομίζοντες· καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν αἰμπελῶν ἀνθρώποις τῆς τε
 ἀσθενείας, καὶ τῆς ἐμψυχίας νόσου τε καὶ ὑγιείας· καὶ ὁ μόνον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,

“ what

“ what were deemed to be *Demons* and *Heroes*;
 “ that *Dreams* were sent to Men by these, and
 “ also the *Signs of Sickness and Health*; and not
 “ only to Men, but also to *Sheep and other Cat-*
 “ *tle*; That *Expiations, Avertments, and all*
 “ *Divination and Omens, and the like, were to*
 “ be referred to them; that when any one died,
 “ *Mercury* was the Director and Guide of their
 “ *Souls*: Such as were pure he conducted to the
 “ higher Regions, that such as were impure might
 “ not approach them; and as to the impure,
 “ they were bound by the *Furies in Chains* that
 “ could not be broke.” *Pythagoras* look’d upon
 the Air to be full of Souls, meaning by *Soul*, ac-
 cording to the Language of the Philosophers, a
 spiritual Substance in general, of which Kind,
 God, in his Opinion was^k. He makes a Diffe-
 rence between Demons and Heroes, as *Thales* did,
 and the very same I make no doubt, for they had
 both one Master, *Pherecydes the Syrian*; nay *Py-*
thagoras heard *Thales* himself, as *Jamblichus* wit-
 nesses^l. If this was the Case, the Heroes, and
 not the Demons, were the departed Souls of Men;
 and the pure Souls who were conducted to the
 higher Regions by *Mercury*, were of the first Sort
 (if of that) and not of the second: But be this as
 it will, he was far from confounding Demons with
 the Souls of Men (though he might esteem them
 both of the same Nature, viz. spiritual Substances)
 for he reckon’d them more than one Degree su-

αἰθερὰ καὶ πνεύματα, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις κίνησιν. Τὸν Ἑρμῆν, ἱερῶν ἐν
 τῷ ψυχῶν — καὶ ἀγέας μὲν τὰς καθαρὰς ἐπὶ τὴν ὕψιστον. τὰς δὲ ἀ-
 καθαρίσας μὴν ἐμείνας πελάζειν, μὴτε ἀλλήλους, δεῖν δὲ ἐν αἰ-
 ῆσι δεσμοῖς ὑπὸ Ἑρμῆων. *Laert. Pythag.*

^k *Just. Mart. Cohort. p. 85. Clem. Alex. tom. i. p. 62. &*
Adnotat. Cicero de Nat. Deor. l. i. c. 11. Min. Felix, c. xix.
Porphyr. vit. Pythag. § 41, aliiq.

^l *Jamblich. vit. Pythag. p. 9.*

perior,

perior, declaring, as *Jamblichus* relates, both in the *World*, and in *Life*, and in *Cities*, and in *Nature*, that which preceeds to be more honourable than that which follows; as the *East* to be more honourable than the *West*, — the *Gods* than the *Demons*, the *Demons* than the *Demigods*, the *Demigods* than *Men*^m. This shews he thought the *Demons* next in Rank to the *Gods*; and I find *Ocellus Lucanus*, who was a *Pythagorean*, has given us a like Arrangement, *Gods*, *Demons*, and *Men*ⁿ. It seems the old Philosophers, *Thales*, *Pythagoras*, and *Ocellus*, as well as the old Poets *Homer* and *Hesiod*, had a Notion of a middle Rank of Creatures intervening betwixt *God* and us, from whencesoever they had it; which makes it still the more probable, that the Demonology of the Ancients was founded in the imperfect Traditions they had concerning Angels. I observe you are pleas'd to think the Heathen World knew nothing of Angels^o; by which if you mean they entertained not the same precise Notions of them that we and the Ecclesiastical Writers do, I agree with you; but then this does not hinder but the *Demons*, who were a Part of the Theology of the *Gentiles* before *Homer* and *Hesiod*, and consequently long before *Thales* and *Pythagoras*, might be originally introduced in the Place of the Angels, of whom the more early Ages might have some scatter'd obscure Hints. The Author of the Verses, which many of the Heathens themselves attributed to *Orpheus*, mentions Angels, as *Grotius* observes^p: And

^m Αποφαίνων, ἔν τε τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ τῷ βίῳ καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν, καὶ τῇ φύσει μᾶλλον τιμωρόν τὸ προηγούμενον, ἢ τὸ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐπόμενον· οἷον τὸ ἀνατολὴν τὸ δύσεως — τὰς μὲν θεάς τῶν δαιμόνων, ἐκείνης δὲ τῶν ἡμιθέων, τὰς Ἡρώας δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Jamblich. vit. Pythag.* p. 28. Edit. Kusteri.

ⁿ *Ocellus Lucanus*, p. 532. Ed. Galei.

^o Further Enquiry, p. 9.

^p *Grotius ad Matth. i. 20.*

Should it be objected that *Thales* and *Pythagoras* might get the Hint from the East, I ask, why the more ancient *Greeks* might not do so too: *Cadmus* was a *Phœnician*, and *Orpheus* made a Tour into *Ægypt*. But to return, *Pythagoras* certainly made a Difference betwixt *Demons* and the *Souls of Men*; *Impure Souls*, says he, were bound by the *Furies in Chains that could not be broke*. Now the *Pythagoreans* held evil *Demons*, as is evident from *Ocellus Lucanus*¹, *Empedocles*², and the Author quoted by *Origen*³: The Existence of an evil Genius or Demon, that influenced Men to Wickedness, was the distinguishing Doctrine of *Pythagoras* and his School⁴. But more directly, *Pythagoras* himself held evil *Demons* according to *Laertius*, for they must be evil *Demons* that sent νόσος, Diseases, to Mankind and Cattle; so I read that Passage of *Laertius*, ἡ ἐκ τῶν τέτων πέμπεθ' ἀνθρώποις τὰς τε νόσους, ἡ τὰ σημεῖα νόσος τε ἡ ὑγίαιας· ἡ δ' μόνον ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ ἡ προβάτοις, ἡ τοῖς ἄλλοις κήνησιν. Vit. Pythag. p. 514. Ed. Amst. How could the Signs of Sicknefs and Health be sent to Cattle, who are incapable of taking Notice of them? I read, τὰς τε νόσους ἡ τὰ σημεῖα, νόσος τε ἡ ὑγίαιας, restraining the two latter to the Cattle; and this Conjecture I since find confirm'd by Cod. Cant. which expressly has it so: See Var. Lect. at the End of *Meibomius's* Edition. *Lactantius*, speaking of the *Demons*, joyns Diseases and Dreams together, just in the same manner, qui quoniam sunt spiritus tenues & incomprehensibiles, insinuant se corporibus hominum, & occulte in visceribus operati valetudinem vitiant, morbos citant, somniis animos terrent, &c. lib. ii. c. 14. and so *St. Cyprian*, Vitam turbant,

¹ *Ocellus Lucanus*, pag. 532. Ed. Galei.

² *Plutarch* περὶ Εὐθυμίας.

³ *Origen contra Cels.* l. vii. p. 335, 336.

⁴ *Mr. Warburton's Divine Legation of Moses*, tom. i. p. 125.

SOMNOS inquietant, irrepentes etiam in corporibus occulte mentes terrent, membra distorquent, VALETUDINEM FRANGUNT, MORBOS LACESSUNT, Cyprian de Idol. Vanit. p. 206. Ed. Paris. and see Dr. Davies's Annotations on Min. Felix, p. 136. As to the Argument, Origen's Pythagorean concluded that Homer believ'd there were evil Demons, because of the Plague sent among the Greeks by Apollo. Orig. contra Cels. l. vii. p. 335. But Pythagoras's Notion may be best learnt from his famous Metempsychosis; the Passage of Laertius, wherein he is said to have taught, that when any one died, MERCURY was the Director and Guide of their Souls, &c. is hardly compatible with the Transmigration of Souls, which however was certainly a Doctrine of his: According to this, the Souls of Men were immortal, and were continually circulating out of one Body into another; and if the Souls were employ'd on this manner, his Demons must be different from them.

From Plato two Places are produc'd which are thought very full to your Purpose, the first from the Cratylus, runs thus: "Do you know, says "Socrates", what Beings those are which Hesiod

οἶδα ἐν τίνας φησὶν Ἡσίοδος εἶναι τὰς δαίμονας; Εἰ. οὐκ οἶκω. Σω. εἰδὲ ὅτι χρυσῶν γένετο τὸ πρῶτον φησὶ γένεσθαι τὸ ἀνθρώπων; Εἰ. οἶδα τὰτό γε. Σω. λέγεις τοῖον πᾶσι αὐτῷ,

Αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴν τῷτο γένετο καὶ Μοῖρ' ἐκαλύψε,

Οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἀγνοῖ ἐπιχθόνιοι καλέοντ',

Εὐθλοὶ, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Εἰ. Τί ἐν δὴ; Σω. Ὅτι οἶμαι ἐγὼ λέγειν αὐτῶν τὸ χρυσῶν γένετο, οὐκ οἶμ' χρυσῶ πεφυκός, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὸν τε καὶ καλόν· τεκμήριον δέ μοι εἶναι, ὅτι καὶ ἡμᾶς φησὶ (ἰδοῦσθαι εἶναι γένετο. Εἰ. Ἀληθῆ λέγεις. Σω. Οὐκὲν καὶ τὸ νῦν οἶσθ' ἂν φάσαι αὐτῶν, εἰ τις ἀγαθός ἐστιν, εἰκέναι εἶ χρυσῶ γένεσθαι; Εἰ. Εἰκός γε. Σω. Οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ, ἀλλό τι ἢ φρονημοὶ; Εἰ. Φρονημοὶ. Σω. Τῷτο τοῖον πάντες μᾶλλον λέγεις ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τὰς δαίμονας, ὅτι φρονημοὶ καὶ δαίμονες; ἦσαν, δαίμονας αὐτὸς εἰς ἀνόμους καὶ ἐν γε τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ φωνῇ αὐτὸ (ὁμοειδὲς τὸ ὄνομα· λέγεις δὲ καλῶς καὶ εἶπες καὶ ἄλλοι ποιεῖται πολλοὶ ὅσοι λέ-

" calls

“ calls *Demons*? *Hermogenes* answers, I don’t know.
 “ *Socr.* Nor don’t you know that he said, that
 “ the *first Generation of Men* was golden? *Herm.*
 “ I know this. *Socr.* He says of *this*, when this
 “ *Generation* died, these were called *Demons*, chaste,
 “ *Earthly*, Good, *Drivers away of Evil*, the
 “ *Guards of mortal Men*. [*Herm.* What then?
 “ *Socr.* Why he calls it in my Opinion the *golden*
 “ *Generation*, not because it was made of *Gold*,
 “ but because it was *good*: My Reason for it is,
 “ that he calls ours the *Iron Race*. *Herm.* You
 “ say right. *Socr.* Don’t you think therefore,
 “ if any of the present Race were *good*, he
 “ would not say they were of the *golden* Genera-
 “ tion? *Herm.* I think he would. *Socr.* But
 “ are the *Good* different from the *Wise* and *Pru-*
 “ *dent*? *Herm.* No. *Socr.* ’Tis thus therefore in
 “ my Thoughts he calls the *Demons*; because they
 “ were *prudent* and *knowing* [δαίμονες] he calls
 “ them *Demons* [δαίμονες] and in our old Lan-
 “ guage, the Name agrees with this.] He therefore
 “ and many other Poets say *well*, who say that
 “ when any *good Man* dies, he obtains great Ho-
 “ nour, and becomes a *Demon*, according to the
 “ Meaning of the Word. And I agree to this;
 “ every *wise Man*, that is a *good Man*, is a *De-*
 “ *mon*, whether he is *alive* or *dead*, and is rightly
 “ called a *Demon*.” The next from the fifth Book
de Republica, is on this wise, “ ^x When any one

γεσιν, ὡς ἐπειδὴν τις ἀγαθὸς ὢν τελευτήσῃ, μεγάλῳ μῶρει καὶ τι-
 μῇ ἔχῃ, καὶ γινέσθαι δαίμονα, καὶ τὸ τὴν φρονήσεως ἐπωνυμίαν ταύτην
 εἶναι τίθεσθαι καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν δαίμονα πάντ’ ἀνδρῶν, ὅς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς ἢ, δαι-
 μόνιον εἶναι, καὶ ζῶντα καὶ τελευτήσαντα, καὶ ὁμοῦ δαίμονα καλεῖσθαι.
 Plato in *Cratylus*, p. 52.

^x Τῶν δὲ δὴ ἀπθανόντων ἐπὶ σεβείας, ὅς ἐστιν οὐδοκιμήτας τελευ-
 τήσῃ, ἀεὶ ἢ πρῶτον μὲν φήσομεν ὅτι χρυσὸν ἔχουσιν εἶναι; πάντων γε μά-
 λιστα· ἀλλ’ ἢ πεισόμεθα Ἡσιόδῳ ἐπειδὴν τινες ὅτι τοιοῦτον ἔχουσιν τε-
 λευτήσωσιν, ὡς ἄρα

“ having

“ having behav’d himself well in War dies, shall
 “ we not say that he belonged to the *golden Age*?
 “ Certainly. And shall we not agree with *Hesiod*,
 “ *that* when any of that Age died, they
 “ are *Demons*, pure, conversing with those on
 “ Earth, good, Diverters of Evil, Guardians of
 “ Men? No doubt. If then we consult [the]
 “ God, how we ought to esteem *Demons* and
 “ Godlike Persons, and what Honour ought to
 “ be paid them, we shall esteem them as he ap-
 “ points. Why not? and hereafter will regard
 “ and worship their *Sepulchres* as the Repositories
 “ of *Demons*. The same also do we decree, when-
 “ ever any one of those who have been *excellently*
 “ *good in Life*, dies either of old Age, or in any
 “ other manner.”

’Tis obvious to observe, upon both these Pas-
 sages, that the Reasoning is entirely founded up-
 on those Verses of *Hesiod* explain’d above. The
 Philosopher writes and argues upon the Hypo-
 thesis of the Poet; first referring all good and
 wise Men, and all that behave well in War, to
 the *golden Age*, and then, as *Hesiod* calls the Men
 of that Generation *Demons*, inferring, that such
 as these, may by parity of Reason be called so
 too; more particularly as to the *Cratylus*, where
 the Philosopher is professedly treating of Etymo-
 logy, δαίμων is *quasi* δαήμων, and signifies *wise*,
 which he looks upon to be the same as *good*,

Οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἀγνοῖ ἐπιχθόνιοι τελέουσιν,

Εὐλοὶ, ἀλεξίκακοι φύλακες, μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

πεισόμεθα μὲν οὖν, Διαιτυθόμηναι ἄρα ἔστι θεῶν πῶς χρὴ τὰς δαιμό-
 νιας τε καὶ θεῖας τιθεῖναι, καὶ τίνι Διαιφύρω, ἥτις καὶ ταύτην θήτομεν ἢ
 αὐτὴν ἐξηγήσῃ; τι δὲ μέλλομεν καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν δὴ χρῆνον, ὡς δαιμόνων,
 ἥτις θεοποιούμεν τε καὶ προσκυνητοῦμεν αὐτῶν τὰς θήκας· ταῦτα
 δὲ ταύτην νομίζομεν, ὅταν τις γῆρας ἢ τίνι ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ τελευτήσῃ· ἢ
 ἔσσι αὖν Διαιφύρωσις ἐν τῇ βίῃ ἀγαθοὶ κελεύσιν. *Plato de Republi.*
 lib. v. p. 420.

whereupon

whereupon he [thinks *Hesiod* did well in calling the good Men of the Golden Age *Demons*, according to the Import of the Name, which conveys an Idea of *Wisdom*¹, and that according to the Meaning of the Word any good Man, dead or alive, might be called a *Demon*; his adding *alive*, plainly shews he only alludes here to the Etymon assigned. In the other Passage he is speaking of the Encouragement proper for the Brave; he would have them rewarded in their Life time, and after their Death, and fetches Examples both from *Homer* and *Hesiod*; and when, according to the latter, he would have demoniacal Honours paid to them (as also to other Persons eminently good) it is a mere political Encouragement of Bravery and Goodness, and not a Declaration of his own Opinion of the Nature of *Demons*: This must be sought for elsewhere; and if you look into those Dialogues where he industriously speaks of the Order and Offices of those Beings, you will find he was far from thinking them the *Souls of dead Men*. In the *Apology*², they are either *Gods*, or the *Sons of the Gods*; this was not only the Opinion of *Socrates*, but of his *Athenian Judges* too. In the *Timæus*³, where he is purposely speaking of the Nature of Things, though he declines giving his own Sentiments of the Origin of these Beings, because it was a matter too high and abstruse for him⁴, and therefore refers us to the *Sons of the Gods* who had spoken of such Things, yet he regards them no otherwise than *Gods*, for *Oceanus* and *Tethys*, *Phorcys*, and *Chronus*, and *Rhea* are

¹ Κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν φρονήσεως ἐπαινομένην.

² *Apolog.* pag. 21. Ed. *Cant.*

³ *Timæus*, pag. 481. Ed. *Bas.*

⁴ Περὶ ὧν ἡ ἀλλὰ δαίμονων εἶπεν, καὶ πῶς αὐτοὶ καὶ θεοὶ, μᾶλλον ἢ κατ' ἡμᾶς, φησὶ ἡ.

there called *Demons*. You blame *Athenagoras* for quoting this Passage, “ as a plain Evidence, that “ *Plato* thought it above his Abilities to say any “ thing of the Origin of *Demons*, or generated “ Gods; for supposing he did not speak in *this* “ Place, has he not spoke sufficiently in his *Cratylus*, and in his Books of *Commonwealth* about “ *Demons*? By no means; he follows *Hesiod* in those Places just as here he follows *the Sons of the Gods*; and from hence one sees the Reason why in those Passages he treads in the Steps of an ancient Author. *Plato* was very well appriz’d of the Existence of this Class of Beings, and of the Rank they held in the Creation, and hath deliver’d his Opinion thereupon with all imaginable Clearness, but he refuses to declare his own Sentiments as to the Origin of them^d; and therefore I must think *Athenagoras*’s both a true and a judicious Observation. I proceed; in the *Phædrus* he joins the *Demons* and the *Gods* together, and ^f *Macrobius* observes, though by Mistake he quotes the Passage from *Timæus*, that *Gods* and *Demons* are there synonymous. In the *Politicus*^g, he calls the supreme Being μέγας δαίμων; he certainly thought he that made the World was more than *the Soul of a Man*. In the *Symposium*^h, we have

^c Further Enquiry, p. 14.

^d Περὶ τῶν ἄλλων δαιμόνων εἰπεῖν καὶ γινῶσθαι τὴν φύσιν, μέζον ἢ καθ’ ἡμᾶς; are his Words.

^e *Phædrus*, p. 202.

^f *Macrobius*. Saturn. l. i. c. 23. Nomen autem Dæmonum, cum Deorum appellatione conjungit; aut quia Dii sunt δαίμονες, id est, scientes futuri; aut, ut Posidonius scribit in libris quibus titulus est Περὶ Ἠρώων καὶ Δαιμόνων, quia ex ætherea substantia parta atque divisa qualitas illis est.

^g *Politicus*, p. 122. Ed. Bas.

^h *Symposium*. p. 187. Ὡς οὖν τὰ πρῶτα εἶπεν, μετὰ τὸ θῆναι καὶ ἀθανάτους. Τί ἔν, ὃ Διότιμα; Δαίμων μέγας, ὃ Σώκρατες; καὶ γὰρ πάν

the Definition of a Demon; Love, as was said before, says Diotimas, is between a Mortal and an Immortal. What is he then, Diotimas? a great Demon, for every Being of that Sort is betwixt a God and a Mortal. What Office have they? That of interpreting and carrying Mens Prayers and Sacrifices to the Gods, and the Commands and Returns of these to them, &c. They are describ'd by Plato, as Mr. Hutchinson observesⁱ, “as first employ'd
“in the Creation of Men by Divine Appoint-
“ment; and afterwards as guarding and conduct-
“ing each Individual of the Race, from their
“Entrance into the World, 'till their Departure
“out of it.” “These Characters, as the same
“learned Author remarks^k, are too sublime to be
“drawn for human Ghosts;” these Employ-
ments are above the Reach and Execution of the
Souls of Men, of whose Immortality this Philoso-
pher was but barely certain^l. In short, Plato's
Opinion concerning Demons is demonstrably plain;
it was the same as Pythagoras's, whose Philosophy
he had deeply imbib'd; in the *Cratylus* he ranges
the rational Beings in the self same Order that
Pythagoras does, Gods, Demons, Heroes, and Men^m.
Philo the Jew was a great Admirer and Follower
of Plato and Pythagorasⁿ, and I think it very
plain whom he meant when he said, *whom the o-
ther PHILOSOPHERS call Demons, MOSES is wont
to call ANGELS*^o. I make no Question but Py-

τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξὺ ἐστὶ θεῶν τε καὶ θνητῶν· τίνα, ὡς δ' ἐγὼ, διώκων
ἔχει; ἐρμηνεύον καὶ ἀπαγορευμῆον θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώ-
ποις τὰ ἀπὸ θεῶν· ὧς καὶ τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, ὧς ὅτι, τὰς ἐπιλά-
ξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς ὧς θυσίων, &c.

ⁱ Mr. Hutchinson's Sermon, p. 7. ^k Ibid. p. 8.

^l *Apolog.* pag. ult. ^m *Cratylus*, p. 52.

ⁿ Vid. *Ampliff. Potterum ad Clem. tom. i. p. 360.*

^o Οὗς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, αἰγέλους Μωσὴς ἐκάλετο ὀνομάζειν.

thagoras and *Plato* were uppermost in his Thoughts: And I find *Theodoret* reporting *Plato's* Demons to correspond with the *Angels*: *Plato*, says he^p, called those GODS and DEMONS, whom we call ANGELS, and said they were the Ministers of the supreme Beings. And so *Hierocles*, speaking of *Plato's* Theology^q: Of these the first rational Beings are call'd Celestial and Gods; the Beings of the Region next to this, he calls Ætherial and good Demons, THE INTERPRETERS AND MESSENGERS OF GOOD THINGS TO MEN; the human Race have the last Place, &c. and so say all the Platonists, says Mr. Mede^r. Some indeed have said that *Plato* has the Word ἄγγελος, or Angel in the Scriptural Sense of the Word, as *Min. Felix* c. xxvi. and from him *Cyprianus de Idol. Vanit.* p. 206. see also *Tan. Faber's Epist. lib. i. c. 63.* But I think the Passage of the Philosopher quoted by *Faber* from the fourth Book of Laws does not come up to the Point^r. However, his Demons, in the Opinion of the Greek Writers above mention'd, were certainly tantamount to *Angels*, and sprang from a traditional Doctrine of them. You may therefore, if you please, add *Plato* to the other ancient Philosophers, who acknowledged a Rank of Beings equivalent

^p Θεὸς ὃ καὶ δαίμονας κέκληκεν [Πλάτων] ὃς ἡμεῖς ἄγγελοι προσ-
αγορεύομεν, καὶ τῆς γὰρ λήξεως ἔφησεν ἦ ὃ ἔ ὅλων θεῶν.
Theodoret. Orat. iv. de Materia & Mundo.

^q Ὡν, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα λογικά, θεῶνά τε καὶ θεῶς καλεῖται· ἃ δὲ
ἢ μετ' αὐτοὺς ὕστερα ἔχειν ἔλαχε χώρα λογικά, ἀθέωά τε καὶ
ἀγαθὸς δαίμονας ὀνομάζει, ἔ τε συμπεσόντων ἀνθρώποις ἐμύλων τε
καὶ ἄγγελοι χρομήτες· τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπων φύλον ἔ τελοῦσάων τάξιν
ἐπέχειν, &c. *Hierocles de Prov. & Fato, p. 240. Ed. Needham,*
& pag. 250.

^r Mr. Mede's Works, p. 627.

^{rr} Διότι καὶ τῶν λόγων βαρυλάτῃ ζημία· πάνσι γὰρ ἐπί-
σκοπος τοῖς πᾶσι τὰ τῶν ἐτάχθη Δίκης Νέμεισις ἄγγελος. *Plato*
de Legibus, lib. iv.

and fimilar in many Refpects to the *Angels*^s; and if at any Time, he or any other old Author fhould apply the Word *Demon* to *Men*, or the *Souls of Men*, you may be fure it is always by a Figure, and never in the Striétnefs of the Letter, they never intending thereby to confound the Natural Difference fubfifting between thefe two Kinds of Beings: Such fort of Expreffions are very frequent in the Writings of the Ancients, both *Greeks* and *Romans*^t; but they are always ufed by way of Compliment, or of Encouragement, or of Similitude, or *ex Hypothefi*, or laftly, in declaring hyperbolically, fome great Advancement or Exaltation, fuch as that of good Men in this Life, or after their Deaths. It would be highly abfurd to underftand fuch Paffages literally; as likewise to

^s Mr. *Hutchinfon's* Sermon, p. 8.

^t See Mr. *Hutchinfon's* Sermon, p. 9. *Suiceri* Thef. Ecclef. tom. i. p. 1370. Edit. 1682. to whom I add the following Paffages: *Homer* has his *ἰοῦθε*, *θεοίκετε*, and the like. *Hefiod* tells his Brother, if he were induftrious, *δαίμονι δ' οἶ* ἦτορα, *Ἔγ.* & *Ἡμερ.* 314. So *Aur. Carm. Pythag.*

Ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατοι θεὸς ἀμβροτοί, *ὅτε* ἔτι θνητὸς. *Empedocles* fays in *Laertius*, *ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν θεὸς ἀμβροτοί, ὅτε* ἔτι θνητὸς πωλλόμεναι. So *Just. Mart. Orat. ad Græc.* p. 145. fpeaking of the Scriptures, *ἦτις* & *ποιεῖ* *ποιεῖ* — ἀλλὰ *παυδόμενα*, *ποιεῖ* τὰς θνητὰς ἀθάνατες, τὰς βροτὰς θεὸς. *Theoph. Antioch.* l. ii. p. 134. of the firft Man, *ὅπως αὐξάνων καὶ τέλει* *χρόνου*, *ἔτι* *καὶ* θεὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς, *ἔτι* *καὶ* εἰς τὸ ἕργον ἀναβῆναι. See alfo p. 142. *Clem. Alex. Protrept.* p. 88. *ἑρμηνεία διδασκαλία* *θεοποιῶν* τὴν ἀνθρώπων. *Clemens* abounds with thefe Expreffions, for which I refer you to the Annotation of the moft excellent and moft Reverend Editor. We have this proverbial Saying in *Zenobius* and *Suidas*, *Ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπου δαιμόνιον*; 'twas ufed when any one was unexpectedly preferv'd by another, and was made happy by him. It is well known what great things the *Stoics* are wont to fay of their wife Men; but I fhall ftop here, and content myfelf with fending you, among the *Romans*, to *Cicero de Orat.* l. i. c. 23. l. ii. c. 42. and in *Somn. Scip. Hor. Od.* i. 1. *Virg. Eclog.* i. 6. iii. 104. *Juvenal Sat.* v. 132.

interpret *Plato* in the Places alledg'd, considering his Sentiments of *Demons* so plainly deducible from the other Parts of his Works any otherwise than *etymologically* as to the one, and *æconomically* as to the other; the first lies in a Work where Etymology is his Subject, and the other in that where he is forming a Commonwealth; *atqui in plerisque Civitatibus intelligi potest, AUGENDÆ VIRTUTIS GRATIA, quo libentius Reipublicæ caussa periculum adiret optumus quisque virorum fortium memoriam honore Deorum immortalium consecratam. Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. iii. c. 19.*

And now, Sir, having gone through the several Allegations in Proof of your Point, *that the ancient Greeks meant by the Word DEMON in general, the Souls of departed Men*; I must leave it with you and the Reader to judge, whether, upon the matter, you have given the World that Satisfaction upon this Head, as might be reasonably expected: Whether you have supported your novel Notion of this Word, in such an unexceptionable manner, as to procure its Reception, in Opposition to the Sense of all Antiquity: Whether your Observations and Arguments are so clear and cogent, as to induce an indifferent Person, or rather a Person us'd, and in some measure attach'd to a different Conception (for Mankind must be consider'd in that Light upon this Occasion) to relinquish an inveterate undoubted Opinion in Favour of yours: Whether, on the other hand, it be not a romantic impracticable Attempt, to fix any such Meaning upon the Word in Question. Your Readers in this Case, as may well be imagin'd, will require uncommon Evidence; and the rather, because they cannot but observe, how demanding and distrustful the Enquirer is, rigorously and

continually calling out for Argument and Proof, and admitting nothing but upon strictest Evidence.

But, good Sir, supposing you to have establish'd your Position beyond all Doubt or Exception, *that the ancient Greeks meant by the Word DEMON in general, the SOULS OF DEPARTED MEN*, would it follow, that the same thing is intended by it in the Scriptures? I apprehend not. It is certainly possible it may have another Sense in them, and should this prove to be the Case, so much of your two Tracts, as relates to the classical Meaning of the Word, is nothing to the Purpose; this Point therefore is well worth your Attention; we will then secondly proceed to examine, with what Reason and Justice you apply the classical Sense of the Word to the Scriptures.

First then, it is possible this Word may carry a different Meaning in the sacred Writings from what it did in the profane. It is a Rule amongst the Critics, *that different Sects often used the same Words in expressing different Tenets*^v. Now the Scriptures proceed upon a System of Theology quite different from the Mythology of the ancient Heathens, which is totally discarded therefrom; and therefore *a fortiori*, this Rule will be truer in Relation to them and the Religion of the idolatrous *Gentiles*, than of one Sect with another.

It is certain again, that there are many Words in the New Testament, which are used in a different Sense from what they are in Classical Greek; I need not point out Instances to you, Sir; these new Acceptations make up one Branch of what is called *the Hellenistic Greek*.

^v *Le Clerc Ars Critic. tom. i. p. 142. Edit. Lond.*

And

And thus it comes to pass, that the Compositions of the ancient *Greeks*, were they all now extant, are not the natural Interpreters of Holy Scripture, universally and in all Cases. I am not for disclaiming the use of human Learning on this Occasion, any more than you are, being thoroughly sensible of the manifold Light that has been thrown upon the sacred Text from thence in more than a thousand Instances. In the Phraseology, the Allusions to ancient Customs, and the like, it is absolutely necessary foreign Authors should be consulted, as where *St. Paul* alludes to the Games of *Greece*, and borrows Metaphors from them; but then where a different Hypothesis is maintain'd, a different System of Theology, and quite different Things are spoken of, *there* the Words must obtain a new and a different Sense: For as the HOLY GHOST in dictating the Language of Scripture, made use of a vulgar Tongue, and was consequently contented with the Words thereof, it must needs be, that those Words must in many Cases, where new Things were delivered, receive new Notions and Ideas. Such Proceeding would not be attended with Obscurity, because the Hypothesis or System, together with the Context, would always render them, as in all other good Writers, sufficiently clear and intelligible. The Word Θεός in Scripture has not the same precise Idea affixed to it, as it has in Heathen Authors; the Λόγος of *St. John* is not the same with that of *Plato*; nor τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον the same as the *Sacer Spiritus* of *Seneca*^x. Σωτήρ is a Name sometimes given to the Heathen Gods, but in a Sense entirely different from that of the Holy Penmen, when they apply it to JESUS CHRIST.

^x *Le Clerc* Ars Critic. tom. i. p. 142.

Διάβολος is a classical Word, but one never meets with it amongst the Ancients in that Sense it mostly has in Scripture, wherein κατ' ἐξοχὴν, and with the Article prefix'd, it denotes the Devil^y. Ἄγγελος too is ascrib'd *novè* to the Angels in the Bible, by Way of Eminence. So Plato's first Principles are these three, Θεός, Ὑλη, and Εἶδος, which may seem at first Sight to correspond perfectly with the Cosmogony of the Bible, *In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth; and the Earth was without Form, and void*: But upon a nearer View it will be found that Plato's Ὑλη is very different from the Chaos of Moses; this was a Creature of God's Hand, but that was coæval with him. This may serve to shew, that it would be equally absurd to interpret the Scripture by the ancient Philosophy or Mythology, as to think of explaining these by that. In short, every thing has its proper Use, and whilst Recourse shall be justly had to the excellent Productions of the Ancients on some Occasions, it shall be very weak and impertinent to repair to them on others. The thing to be explain'd ought always to be carefully attended to; insomuch that some Thought and Judgment is requir'd in the Application of human Literature to the Oracles of God, and that both as to what Cases, and how far.

You are of Opinion, that the settling the Sense of the Word in Dispute, as found in the ancient Greek Writers, is of Consequence in this Controversy^z; and in Pursuance of that Persuasion have thought fit to enquire into the Use and Acceptation of it amongst them, in the manner I am just

^y Reinesius de Deo Endovellico, p. 377. Ed. Creniz.

^z Further Enquiry, p. 2, 25.

now come from examining: But I doubt the Words Δαίμων and Δαιμόνιον will be found to be of that Sort, which it would be very improper and irrational to think of expounding by the Writings of those who *are without*. They concern the Theology of the Bible, betwixt which and that of the ancient *Greeks*, whose Words they originally were, the Difference is infinitely wide; and it would be a perfect Wonder they should retain the same Ideas in that which they had in this. In the one they were the Objects of divine Worship, but in the other they are not. In the one they denoted, as you contend, *the Souls of dead Men*, or as others say, *spiritual Substances superior to Man*; but in the other, as is now and always was believ'd, they import *evil Spirits*. The Scripture Account is, that there subsists an intermediate Order of Creatures betwixt God and us, of which there are different Classes; that one of the first Rank, and a large Number of a lower Class, were sometime before the Creation of this material World, turned out of Heaven for some Crime, and from thenceforward in the Hardness of their Hearts, have continually set themselves against God and Goodness, and have brought unspeakable Woe upon Mankind; the Ringleader of this wretched Crew is called the *Devil*, and the others *Demons*. This, Sir, is the generally receiv'd Opinion; but you, it seems, are pleas'd to make it a Question whether the *evil Angels* of the Devil, are called *Demons* in Scripture, because *Demon* signifies *a departed Soul*, in the ancient *Greek Writers*; but is not this very wild Reasoning? Another might as well say, that *Demon* does not mean *a departed Soul* in *Homer*, for it signifies an *evil Spirit* in the Scriptures; or that it means an evil Spirit in *Hesiod*, because it does so in the New Testament.

Testament. If the Ancients had been well acquainted with the Demonology of the Scriptures, and yet in writing upon it, or in alluding to it, had never given the Name of *Demons* to the *Devil's Angels*, but constantly had made use of some other, there would have been some Shew of Argument; but as matters stand, you must excuse me, Sir, in thinking your Argumentation very defective here, and indeed that the whole of your Enquiry into the Meaning of the Word *Demon* amongst the ancient *Greeks* altogether impertinent.

But you yourself at last seem sensible of this, for you have appeal'd upon *second Thoughts* in the *Further Enquiry*, to the Scriptures upon this Head, asserting, "that in all the *Epistles*, the *Acts*, and "the *Revelations*, the Word *Δαίμονιον* is used in "the same Sense, as it was in the Heathen Writers, for *the Souls of departed Men*, and not for "Devils, or evil Spirits^a." Here now you come to the Point; you do Business; and I freely join Issue with you, that if the Word in Question constantly denotes *a departed Soul*, in the other Books of the New Testament, it ought in all Reason to do so in the Evangelists, that is in the Case of the *Demoniacs*.

The Course of this Examination may seem to require that it should now be consider'd, whether your Interpretation of the several Texts produc'd from the *Acts*, the *Epistles*, and *Revelations* will bear that Weight you are pleas'd to put upon them; but as the literal Interpretation is the defensive Side of the Question, I may be allow'd to offer something in behalf of that, and then subjoin your Allegations, as Objections to it.

^a Further Enquiry, p. 42.

I shall therefore now thirdly evince the true Scriptural Notion of the Words *Δαίμων* and *Δαιμόνιον*.

It is well known that the Apostles and Evangelists made use of the *Septuagint* Version of the Old Testament; for which Reason it will be proper previously to enquire in what Sense the Seventy, together with the *Greek Jews* who used their Version, apply the Words. These all followed the Bible System of Theology, and amongst them consequently we naturally seek for the Signification of these theological Terms. Now it will be found upon Examination, that with the Seventy, the Word *Δαιμόνιον* is always used in a bad Sense^c. It matters not in this Case what original Words the Interpreters render by *Δαιμόνιον*; they might not always act consistently, translating the same by the same; or they might not interpret faithfully every where; but they constantly mean evil Beings by that *Greek* Word; and that is enough. It appears that these Translators had an Idea of *evil Angels*^c; and what follows will shew you, that by those evil Beings they call *Demons*, they meant *evil Spirits*, or *evil Angels*.

In the Translation of the Book of *Tobit*, the Word *Δαιμόνιον* “ is certainly used, as you confess “ yourself, for an evil Spirit: And be the Book a “ real History or a Romance, it is certain Evidence of the meaning of a Word at the Time “ it was made;” but then to invalidate any Argument, that may be brought from the Diction of

^b DEUT. xxxii. 17. Ps. xcvi. 5. cvi. 37. xci. 6. Is. xxxiv. 14. xiii. 21. lxxv. 11.

^c PSAL. lxxviii. 49. and Is. xxx. 4. and so the Vulgar in *Philo's* Time talk'd of evil Angels. *Philo de Gigant.* p. 192.

this Apocryphal Book, you alledge, that “ unless
 “ we could tell when the Version was made, and
 “ what was the original Word so render’d, little
 “ use can be made of it on either Side of the pre-
 “ sent Debate.” We need not be solicitous a-
 bout the original Word, for let that be what it
 would, the Word *Δαιμόνιον* is there used for an *evil Spirit* : And as to the Age of it, though I do
 not pretend to fix the precise Time when the
 Book was translated out of *Chaldee* into *Greek*,
 which is indeed uncertain, yet I will venture to
 say it was done *about the Time*, or rather, as I
 think, *before* the Incarnation of our Blessed Sa-
 viour ; which is sufficient for the present Purpose.
 It is quoted by *Polycarp*^d, and *Clemens Alexandri-
 nus*^e, who both lived in the second Century, and
 the former, being a Disciple of St. *John*’s, flou-
 rished at the Beginning of it. Considering this,
 you will hardly think I have put the Age of this
 Translation too high. It was made then about
 the Time I speak of, by some *Greek Jew* of *A-
 lexandria*, *Palæstine*, or *Antioch*, who all used the
 LXX Version, and is substantial Proof of the
 Sense the Word *Δαιμόνιον* had then obtained, as
 likewise how it was then understood as lying in
 the LXX Version.

If you reflect upon the Time when the LXX
 Version was made, first of the *Pentateuch*, and
 then of the other Books of the Old Testament,
 and compare it with the Age of *Plato*, you will
 find the Translators had Reason enough to give
 this Appellation to the rebellious Part of the first
 Order of created Beings. *Plato*’s Demons are joint

^d Antiqua Versio Epist. Polycarpi, p. 189. Ed. Cotelærii.

^e Clem. Alex. tom. i. p. 503. tom. ii. p. 791.

Rulers with the Great Demon^f, the common Inter-nantii between Gods and Men^g. He employs them first in the Creation of Men by divine Appointment, and afterwards in guarding and conducting each Individual of the Race, from their Entrance into the World 'till their Departure out of it. And accordingly *Philo the Jewish Platonist* writes, if I may invert his Words, *Moses* is wont to call those *Angels*, which the other *Philosophers* call *Demons^h*. The *Hellenistic Jews*, if you will permit me to call the LXX by that Name, saw at the same Time, that this was the Name that *Plato* and others of the Ancients gave to their Gods, or at least to a secondary Class of them, whom they for their Parts could not but regard as evil Beings, on every Account; but especially for that they had so impudently usurped and monopolized the Worship of the one true God: More than this, they saw this Name actually given by the Heathens themselves to evil Beings; and therefore it was a proper Appellation whereby to distinguish

^f Οἱ Κυβερνήται τῶ μεγίστῳ δαίμονι θεοί. *Plato* in *Politico*, p. 122.

^g Ἑρμηνεύοντες καὶ Διαπορευομένοντες θεοὺς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ διὰ θεῶν. *Plato* in *Sympos.* p. 187.

^h Οὗς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωσῆς εἶπεν ὀνομάζειν. *Philo* de *Gigantibus*; and whereas *Philo* afterwards says, ψυχὰς ἐν δαίμονας, καὶ ἀγγέλους, ὀνόματα μὲν ἀφ' ἑρμηνείας, ἐν δὲ ταῦτ' ἐν κατὰ τὸν Διαπορευομένον, ἀχθὼ βαρύντατον ἀποθήκη δεισιδαιμονίαν, it is evident that ψυχή here is not to be restrain'd to the human Soul, for how could *Philo* think that was the same with the Ἄγγελοι of *Moses*? but means an immaterial Substance in general. See before pag. 23, 24. So he writes above, Οὗς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωσῆς εἶπεν ὀνομάζειν. ψυχὰς δ' εἰσὶ καὶ τὸν αἴρα πετόμεναι. And thus he reckons the good Angels to be Souls, τὰ ἐν ψυχῶν, οἱ μὲν πρὸς σώματα κατέβησαν, αἱ δ' ἐδενὶ τὴ γῆς μορίων ἤξιωσαν ποιεῖν Κυβερνήται. ταῦτα αἱ ἀριερωθείσαις καὶ τὴ πάλιν διεραπείας ἀντιχορδαίαις ὑπερήτοις καὶ ἀγαθοῖς ὁ δημιουργὸς εἶπεν χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὰ δυνάτων ἐπίστατον. *Philo* de *Gigantibus*, p. 192.

in their Theology, those malignant Spirits, who had swerved from their Allegiance along with the Arch-Fiend, from those upright Beings of the same Rank, who still persisted in their Obedience and Service to the Lord of All; and accordingly they so apply'd it: Insomuch as that Insinuation of yoursⁱ, that the Demons of the ancient *Greeks* were all originally *good Beings*, were it never so true, would have stood you in no stead, for nothing is more usual than for Words to come from an *indifferent* to a *bad* Sense; or, if you will, from a *good* one to a bad one^k.

That this was the Sense the LXX and the other *Hellenists* had put upon this Word, is further evident, from its having the like use amongst the Holy Penmen of the New Testament, who still went upon the System of the Bible, and made use of the Scriptural Language of the Time, viz. that which is called, though perhaps improperly, *the Hellenistic Greek*.

I think all competent Judges agree in the Similitude of Style and Diction in the Writers of the New Testament, and the *Greek* Translators of the Old. Our Countryman, the late Mr. *Blackwall*, propos'd to give us "A Dissertation upon the LXX, and the Advantages of studying it, in order to have a better Notion of the Sense and Taste of the Beauties of the *Greek* Testament^l." *Hugh Broughton*, another of our Countrymen, had composed a Lexicon out of the LXX, for the better understanding the New Testament^m; it was given to *Sion* College, but does not appear in that Library now, having been lost, as I am in-

ⁱ See before, p. 17. ^k Mr. *Hutchinson's* Sermon, p. 14.

^l *Blackwall's* Sacred Classics, vol. i. p. 81. Ed. 4^{to}.

^m *Joh. Christoph. Welfsi* Not. in *Casanboniana*, p. 204.

form'd by Mr. *Reading*, in the Fire of *London*. M. *George Raphaelius*, a learned Foreigner, who by diligently comparing the Style of the New Testament with that of *Polybius*, *Arrian*ⁿ, and *Xenophon*^o, has elucidated the sacred Text in innumerable Instances, was yet of Opinion that the Style of it might be collated to better Purpose with the Septuagint, and had formed a Design of that Sort^p; which, whether it is yet carried into Execution or not, I cannot tell. To him I might joyn *Lambert Bos*^q, *Johannes Alberti*^r, and six hundred more, who in illustrating the Diction of the New Testament from profane Authors, have nevertheless Recourse continually to the LXX; but I shall content myself with the reporting the Judgment of the incomparable *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, in whose Death the Republic of Learning has lately sustained an almost irretrievable Loss. This admirable *Grecian* delivers himself thus^s: *The HEBRAISMS which occur in the New Testament, grew partly from the use of the LXX Version, and partly*

ⁿ *Hamburgi*, 1715. ^o *Hamburgi*, 1720.

^p *Præf. ad Annotationes ex Arriano & Polybio. & p. 36. ejusdem Operis.*

^q *Exercitationes Philologicæ.*

^r *Observationes Philologicæ.*

^s *Hebraismi vero qui in libris N. T. obvii sunt, partim ab usu versionis LXX Interpretum, partim a scribentium consuetudinum profluxere, qui Hebræo-Chaldaico generi loquendi adfueti, etiam cum Græce scriberent, ducebant aliquem idiomatis illius colorem. Et paulo post: Qui porro novum veluti linguæ genus effinxerunt viri doctissimi quod vocarunt Hellenisticum, nimium dixere illi quidem & minus commode usi sunt vocabulo: quocunque tamen nomine appelles, certum est singularem quandam & ab aliis scriptoribus Græcis differentem non linguam nec dialectum, sed colorem dictionis Græcæ Stylique in libris N. Fœderis extare, cui nihil usquam similis aut propius eo nomine accedens reperitur, quam Græca LXX Interpretum versio Veteris Testamenti. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. tom. iii. p. 224.*

from the Turn of the Writers, who being accustomed to the HEBRÆO-CHALDAIC Manner of speaking, could not help drawing some Strokes of that Idiom, even when they were writing Greek. And presently after: Those learned Men who devised a new kind of Language, which they called HELLENISTIC, carried the matter too far, and used an improper Word: But by whatever Name you please to call it, it is certain, there is a peculiar, not Language, or Dialect, but Strain of Style and Diction in the Greek Testament, different from other Greek Writers; Nothing is so like it, or comes nearer to it than the LXX Version.

As to this particular Case, I desire you would compare I COR. x. 20. with DEUT. xxxii. 17. St. Paul's Words are ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύει τὰ ἔθνη, δαιμονίοις θύει, καὶ εἰ θεῶν. and in Deuteronomy it is written, ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις, καὶ εἰ θεῶν; and likewise attend to the following Observations, which I hope may convince you, that the New Testament Writers always put the Words in the Sense I contend for.

MATTH. ix. 34. xii. 24. MARK iii. 22.
LUK. xi. 15.

Beelzebub is called the Prince of the Devils; that is, he is called a Demon; and the Demons in virtue of this Expression, were of the same Nature with him. When Agamemnon is called King of Men, it signifies to us, that he was one of the same Species. But the thing follows plainly from the Argumentation of our Blessed Saviour, Every Kingdom divided against itself is brought to Desolation: and every City or House divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided

τ' ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων.

against

against himself; how shall then his Kingdom stand? MATTH. xii. 25, 26. The Subjects of a Kingdom, the Citizens of a City, and the Domestic of a Family, are all of the same Nature with their respective Heads or Governors; it runs, if *Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself*; this is the Application of the other short Parables; and here both *Beelzebub* and the *Demons* are called *Satan*, and consequently they were all Devils. I observe that the Fathers of the Church do accordingly style the Devil, a *Demon*^x.

Before I proceed to another Text, I would here take Notice, that your Observation, “that the “Gospels constantly put a Difference betwixt δ “Διάβολο and Δαίμων, and never confound the “Words, the Devil and Demon^x” is of no manner of use to you; for the Answer to the Question you there put, “whence should this “happen, if the sacred Writers did not make a “Difference betwixt Demons, and Devils, or evil Spirits” is very obvious. The Scriptures do make a Difference between those Words, but it is no more than that which subsists between a Prince and his Subjects, who both partake of one common Nature, but the Prince, as presiding over the rest, has a peculiar Name of his own: To the Prince the Scriptures give the Name of ὁ Διάβολο, and to the Subjects that of *Demons*, and in *them* they are not convertible Terms both Ways; but still the Devil is, and may be called a *Demon*, just as a Prince is, and may be called a *Man*. In after Ages it came to be otherwise, and the *Demons* were called *Devils*, as they are at this Day

^x *Iust. Mart. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 87. Theoph. Antioch. lib. ii. p. 146. Tertullian Apolog. c. 22.*

^x Preface to Further Enquiry.

in our Language, the Use and Custom of which has given this Appellation to *Demons*; even tho' it is certainly derived ultimately from the Greek Word Διάβολος^y; for which Reason I see no harm in rendering Δαίμονες or Δαιμόνια by *Devils*, so long as it is understood that by *Demons* are meant *evil Spirits* or *Angels of the Devil*; though it may not strictly answer the Terms of the Original. But at the same Time I would not pertinaciously contend with you or any Man who should chuse to read *Demons* in our Version rather than *Devils*; the Alteration would be of no Consequence in this Dispute either Way.

LUKE xiii. 11.—16.

11. *And behold, there was a Woman, which had a Spirit of Infirmary eighteen Years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. —*
 16. *And ought not this Woman being a Daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo these eighteen Years, be loosed from this Bond on the Sabbath Day?*

The Woman whose Case is here recorded, had a Spirit of Infirmary eighteen Years, and was bound by *Satan* so long. You think this was no *Demoniacal* Case^z, but if it was not such, it was a *Diabolical* one; the Woman was bound by *Satan*, by the Devil himself^a. Whereupon I form the Argument, that the *Demons* who are represented in the New Testament as bringing Diseases upon People, were of a *Diabolical* Nature, that is, were Agents or Angels of the Devil. I observe what you have upon this Case, *Enquiry*, p. 54. where

^y Reinesius de Deo Endovellico, p. 377. Ed. Crenii.

^z *Enquiry*, p. 54.

^a Ἦν ἑδραίων ὁ Σατανᾶς.

you say, “ A *Spirit of Infirmary* is nothing but an
 “ *infirm Disposition*, or *Habit*, in the *Jewish* Phrase-
 “ ology ; — and as to the other Expression — *Sa-*
 “ *tan hath bound her* — that Word would have
 “ been used whatever was the true Cause of this
 “ Indisposition — *Satan* is nothing else but *Ad-*
 “ *versary*, and is to be understood according to
 “ the Subject to which it is apply’d ; ” and then
 you give some Instances where it is used in that
 lax Sense. I answer, the Word *Σατανᾶς*, with the
 Article prefix’d, always signifies the *Devil* in the
 New Testament, and that you neither have, nor
 can produce one Instance to the contrary.

ACTS x. 38.

The *Devil* is here expressly said to do, what the
Demons, that is, his Angels did ; just as a King
 or Prince in Authors is made to do, what his
 Soldiers or Ministers, or any other of his Agents
 transact for him. St. Peter tells *Cornelius* and his
 Company, that they knew *How God had anointed*
JESUS of NAZARETH with the Holy Ghost, and
with Power ; who went about doing good, and heal-
ing all that were oppressed of the Devil : For God
was with him. The Words, *healing all that were*
oppressed of the Devil, allude to a visible Fact in
 the Life of *Jesus Christ* ; the Apostle appeals to
 something notoriously apparent, that was seen or
 known as well by these *Gentiles*, as by the *Jews*,
 and that was the Expulsion of *Demons* ; and where-
 as it is added, *for God was with him*, it is as much
 as to say, his Cures of that Sort were all done by
 the Power of GOD ; just as our Blessed Saviour
 asserts MATTH. xii. that what he did in ejecting
Demons was by the Finger of God, and not thro’
Beelzebub the Prince of the *Demons* ; and so Origen

H

understands

understands this Text^a. From hence then I gather that the *Demons* of the Evangelists were all evil Angels of the Devil. And whereas it is asserted by you, “ that the Scriptures use the Word “ *Demoniacs*, [I suppose you mean Δαιμονιζόμενοι] “ but never expressly attribute this Disorder to the “ Devil or his Angels^b;” the Possessions in general, are here ascribed to the *Devil*, as being all effected by his Instruments and Agents, that is his Angels; and you will please to remember, that the Disorder of the Woman who had the Spirit of Infirmary eighteen Years, is attributed, as we have just now seen, to the *Devil*, who brought a Disease likewise upon holy *Job*. As to that loose and general way of interpreting this Passage of the “ Recovery of Man from the Power and Dominion “ of the Devil to Obedience to God,” which you ground upon the Expression καὶ ἀδυνατομήν ἐκ τῆς Διαβολῆς, which you say, “ never implies Possession from Demons, or any any thing like it^c:” This was no visible Case, that St. Peter should appeal to that; besides, the possessed Patients were very notably held in Subjection or Vassalage to the Devil; and the Passage may very well be thought to allude to PSAL. cxlvi. 7, 8. *Which executeth Judgment for the Oppressed, which giveth Food to the Hungry, the Lord looseth the Prisoners, the Lord openeth the Eyes of the Blind, the Lord raiseth them that are bowed down*; which may be compar’d with JOH. ix. 32. and LUKE xiii. 16. The Expressions of St. Luke there, who is speaking of the Woman that had the Spirit of Infirmary eighteen Years, is very remarkable and apposite to the Point in

^a *Origen contra Cels.* l. viii. p. 420.

^b Further Enquiry, p. 53. and Pref. to Further Enquiry.

^c Further Enquiry, p. 60.

hand, *And ought not this Woman, being a Daughter of ABRAHAM, whom SATAN hath BOUND, lo these eighteen Years, be LOOSED from this BOND on the Sabbath Day?* But methinks the Word *healing*, *ἰατρικὴ*, may help to ascertain the Meaning of this Text; it makes it not only correspond the more perfectly with LUKE xiii. but also restrains it to bodily Diseases; it is a Word frequently used by the Evangelists on the Occasion; St. Peter indeed has apply'd it otherwise in a more general Way to the Salvation of Mankind by CHRIST, by *whose Strypes*, says he, *ye were healed*, 2 PET. ii. 24. But this is an elliptical Locution, the entire Sense being, *by whose Strypes ye are healed of your Infirmities*. You say, “the Design of St. Peter has “nothing to do with *bodily Cures*, or such little “Considerations.” Not with the curing of *mere bodily Diseases*, I grant you, but the curing of Persons corporally possessed by evil Angels of the Devil it has. This is no little Consideration; it is a Fact, and a Fact of the utmost Importance, as it shew'd *Cornelius* and the whole World, by a plain and sensible Effect, that our Blessed Saviour was invested with a Power superior to all the Powers of Darkness, and was the Person, who was to recover Man from the Dominion and Vassalage of the Devil. There is no manner of Occasion for you to depart from the Letter, to obtain the Sense you strike out; but if to get the Sense, you exclude the Letter, you immediately strip St. Peter's Address to *Cornelius* of its Proof, and thereby render it vague, unsatisfactory, and dogmatical.

I COR. X. 20, 21.

20. *But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice unto Devils and not to God: and I would not that ye should have Fellowship with Devils.*

21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.*

Devils or Demons here are the Gods of the Nations, and are opposed to the true GOD throughout, just as in the LXX Version, DEUT. xxxii. 17. PSAL. xcvi. 5. see also PSAL. cvi. 37. from whence it necessarily follows, that *Demons* here mean evil Spirits or Angels of the Devil; these were the *Gods of this World*, by which Phrase St. Paul characterizes the Devil, 2 COR. iv. 4.

I TIM. iv. 1.

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter Times some shall depart from the Faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils.

Doctrines of Devils, are the Suggestions of evil Spirits, or of the Angels of the Devil, that grand Seducer, who by himself, or his Agents, *deceiveth the whole World*^d; for not only the Δαίμονιάρχης himself was busied in deluding the Sons of Men, but his Angels the Demons too, as St. Paul testifies, *Put on the whole Armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the Wiles of the Devil; for we wrestle not against Flesh and Blood, but against Principalities, against Powers, against the Rulers of*

^d REV. xii. 9.

the Darkneſs of this World, againſt ſpiritual Wickedneſs in high Places°. The Devil is called before the *Prince of the Power of the Air*^f, and theſe were the Subjects that conſtituted his Kingdom. What was before urged from the Expreſſion, *the Prince of the Devils*, MATTH. ix. 34, &c. receives much Strength from theſe Texts, for as the Partifans and Subjects of the Arch Fiend are in the Evangelifts ſtyled *Demons*, and in the Epiftles *Principalities and Powers*, it evidently follows that they were one and the ſame, and conſequently, that the Demons had Power over Mankind, and were not departed Souls.

This Comment is greatly confirm'd by 1 TIM. v. 15. *For ſome are already turned aſide after Satan*. For turning aſide after *Satan*, is the ſame thing as departing from the Faith by giving heed to ſeducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils; from whence the Relation between *Satan* and the *Demons* appears, and that following the one, is all one with following the other. This is exactly a parallel Caſe with ACTS x. 38, where the *Devil* is aſſerted to be the Author of All the Poſſeſſions effected by the *Demons*; and St. Peter and St. Paul very notably explain one another.

JAMES ii. 19.

Thou beſt that there is one God, thou doſt well; the Devils alſo believe and tremble.

The Senſe is, if thou *only beſt*, and doſt not bring forth *the Fruits of Faith*, thou doſt no more than what the *Devil* and his *Angels* do, who believe and tremble.

° 2 EPHES. vi. 11, 12.

f Châp. ii. 2.

JAMES iii. 15.

This Wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.

The Apostle is speaking of Envy and Strife, which he says are *devilish*; it must be more than *ψυχική* in the Climax; and indeed Strife and Envy are the specifical Attributes of the Devil. See *Grotius* and *Whitby*.

REV. ix. 20.

And the rest of the Men that were not killed by these Plagues, yet repented not of the Works of their Hands, that they should not worship Devils, and Idols of Gold, and Silver, and Brass, and Stone, and of Wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk.

To whatever Times this Passage relates, the Turn of the Expression is manifestly that which is always used in speaking of the Pagan Idolatry; and the Letter certainly refers to that. So DAN. v. 4. *They drunk Wine, and praised the Gods of Gold, and of Silver, of Brass, of Iron, of Wood, and of Stone.* And Insensibility is in like manner objected to the Heathen Idols by the Royal Psalmist. See PSAL. cxv. 3, seq. cxxxv. 15. *Devils* here are therefore the same as in 1 COR. x. 20. namely the Gods of the Heathen.

REV. xvi. 13, 14.

And I saw three unclean Spirits like Frogs come out of the Mouth of the Dragon, and out of the Mouth of the Beast, and out of the Mouth of the false Prophet: For they are the Spirits of Devils, working Miracles, which go forth unto the Kings of the Earth, &c.

Devils

Devils here must necessarily mean *evil Spirits* superior to the Souls of Men; for the Souls of Men never have the Power of working Miracles attributed to them in Holy Scripture. *Secondly*, The *Devil* has Miracles and Wonders ascribed to him in the sacred Code, therefore these *Demons* must be of a like Nature, and have a like Power with him. *Thirdly*, Whereas the characteristic Appellation, *unclean Spirits*, the same which is perpetually given by the Evangelists to their *Demons*, is here us'd of these *Demons*, who beyond all doubt were evil Spirits or Angels of the Devil, it follows that *those* were likewise his Angels. *Fourthly*, This Text absolutely determines the Sense of the Word *Demon* in the former Place, c. ix. § 20. let that Passage relate to what it will.

To these particular Texts, I now add all the Histories and Passages that relate to *Demoniacs* in the Evangelists; of which the obvious and consistent Meaning is, that they were Persons actually possessed by *evil Spirits* originally more than human. You yourself do not pretend, but that the several Cases and Texts are naturally and intelligibly explain'd in that Way of Interpretation, and are sufficiently reconcileable and consonant one with another.

But that this is the true and proper Sense of the Words in Question throughout the whole New Testament, the Fathers of the Church most clearly evince, representing the Demons unanimously in their Writings, as spiritual Subsistencies, evil, and superior to the Souls of Men. I don't find you much dispute the Sense which the ancient Fathers put upon this Word, but you seem however not duly to have consider'd the Weight they have in this Controversy.

The

The Fathers write upon the System of the New Testament, and are the natural Interpreters thereof: To them we must have the same Recourse, for the right understanding the Theology of the Bible, as we have to *Ovid* and *Apollodorus*, in expounding the ancient Mythology of the Pagans; and their Judgment and Testimonies are cited with more Pertinence and Propriety, more Force and Conclusiveness, than that of *Proclus* or the Scholiast of *Homer* is appeal'd to by you in interpreting *Hesiod*[§]. They liv'd not long after the Apostles; the Language of the New Testament and of the LXX Version, was the Mother Tongue of many of them, and where it was not, yet as it was in their Days a living Language, they had a thorough Knowledge of it, as appears from their Writings. They were acquainted with the Acceptation of the Words in Question, *before* as well as *after* the Gospel Times, and that both in sacred and profane Authors, and yet unanimously, not one or two, but one and all agree, in putting the Sense I contend for upon them. They had perus'd *Homer*, *Hesiod*, *Plato*, and all the best and most authentic Mythologists, were Men of eminent Parts and Learning; and considering the Number of them, and the Consonancy of their Sentiments upon this Head, the Fathers, as Interpreters of Scripture in this Case, have Advantages above what all the extant Scholiasts and Mythologers together can have in Matters relating to their Superstition: For besides those above mention'd, the Silence of the old Enemies of Christianity, who were *Greeks* as well as the Fathers, and must be allow'd to have understood well their own Language, especially the Classical *Greek*, of

§ Enquiry, p. 3.

which

which *Julian* was a great Master, comes in to corroborate very signally the Evidence given by the Fathers. Neither *Celsus*, *Porphry*, or *Julian* ever except to the Sense in which the *Christians* used the Word *Demon*, though these always meant by it evil Beings more excellent in their Nature than the Souls of Men. *Julian* allows our Blessed Saviour to have ejected Demons, without ever arraigning the *Christian* Sense of the Word^h; and *Celsus* in speaking of the Demons always admits them to be of the Nature of *Angels*ⁱ, but being God's Creatures, contends they ought to be worshipped^k: *Porphry* speaks freely of evil *Demons* and their Illusions, both in the Fragments of that Treatise of Philosophy he compil'd from the *Ancient Oracles* preserv'd by *Eusebius*, as likewise in his Books of *Abstinence*.

You imagine it was from that Text, *Thou believest that there is one God, thou doest well; the Devils also believe and tremble*, JAM. ii. 19. "That the Fathers said those things concerning Devils which occur so frequently in their Writings^l." If it was so, that Text alone is sufficient to uphold them in their Interpretation; for no Argument can be plainer or stronger in the Eye of any impartial Judge. But why must the Fathers be thought to have taken up their Notion from that Text only? They put the same Sense upon all the Texts relating to *Demons* or *Demoniacs*, which they have Occasion to handle: In short, it might be from *that* along with the rest, but I am certain it was not from that exclusive of the others: for when *Justin Martyr* says, *the Gods of the Hea-*

^h *Julian* apud *Cyrril. Alex.* lib. vi. p. 191. & 213.

ⁱ See the Places cited, p. 11.

^k *Cels.* apud *Orig.* lib. vii. p. 376. & lib. viii. p. 394, 400.

^l Further Enquiry, p. 47.

then are Demons^m, he had his Thoughts upon PSAL. xcvi. 5. *As for all the Gods of the Heathen they are but Idols*, as is evident both from the sameness of the Words, and from hence that the Passage of the *Psalmist* is quoted immediately before; and before, p. 310. you will find him arguing the Apostacy of some of the Angels very expressly from this Text amongst others; he does not allege there one single Passage from the New Testament, but collects the thing entirely from the Old: And *Origen* produces that Text in Proof of the same Thingⁿ, as you yourself allow^o.

You think some of the Fathers agree with you, in that Observation, “ that the ancient *Greeks* “ meant by the Word *Demon* in general, the Souls “ of departed Men,” and you cite *Tertullian* and *Justin Martyr*^p: Now if it were so, this would not serve your Purpose, for you cannot reason from the Notion of the ancient *Greeks*, to that of the inspired Penmen; these very Fathers, admitting they concurred with you as to the Classical Sense of the Word, are consentient with the rest of their venerable Brethren in understanding the Word, as it lyes in the Bible, of *evil Spirits*, a Degree higher than the Souls of Men. But the worst is, the Passages you produce from these great Authors, are racked by you to a Sense they never thought of. As they both wrote upon the *Christian* Scheme, and accordingly always use the Word *Demon* in other Places for evil Spirits, it is incredible upon the Face of the Assertion, they should any where say, the Souls of such as had once liv’d upon Earth

^m Δαίμονιά εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἑθνῶν. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 318. Ed. Thirlb. the Words of the *Psalmist* are, πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἑθνῶν δαίμονια.

ⁿ *Origen* contra Cels. l. vii. p. 378.

^o Further Enquiry, p. 27. ^p Enquiry, p. 3, 4.

were *Demons*: The Light these great Doctors of the Church had drawn from Scripture, easily let them into the true Nature and Origin of Pagan Idolatry, namely, that the Devil was the first Author of it^a, and that the Affair was afterwards carried on by him and his accursed Instruments^r. These were Points which the Heathen themselves were always totally ignorant of, but yet without recurring to these wicked invisible Agents, we should be at a Loss for an adequate Cause of the palpable Stupidity of the ancient Idolaters. When therefore *Justin Martyr* writes, *the Gods of the Heathen are Demons*^s; and *Tertullian*, *you think those are Gods whom we know to be Demons*^t; it cannot be thought they meant to tell us, the Gods of the Heathen were *departed Souls*; they entertained different Notions of them, esteeming them to be evil Spirits, whose proper Names, according to *Justin Martyr*, were *Jupiter, Apollo, &c.* or who, according to *Tertullian*, procur'd themselves to be worshipped under those Names. But they shall speak for themselves; the former, as was said, thought *Jupiter, Apollo, Neptune, &c.* were the proper Names of the *Demons*: *Heretofore these IMPURE DEMONS under various Apparitions went in unto the Daughters of Men, and defiled Boys, and dress'd up such Scenes of Horror, that such as entered not into the Reasons of Things, but judg'd by Appearance only, stood aghast, and never imagining them to be evil Demons, call'd them GODS, and invoked them by such*

^a *Just. Mart. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 87, 88, 173. Theoph. Ant. lib. ii. p. 144. Cyril. Alex. contra Julian, lib. iii. p. 91.*

^r *Just. Mart. Cohort. p. 128. & Apolog. prima passim.*

^s *Δαίμονες εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἠθῶν, Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 318. Enquiry, p. 4.*

^t *Ipsi putatis eos esse Deos quos nos Dæmonas scimus. Tertull. ad Scapulam. Enquiry, p. 3.*

Names as they had given to themselves*. Justin calls the Devil himself a Demon, whom he scarce thought a departed Soul[†]; and he distinguishes the Demons from all such Souls, in most direct Terms*: *When he shall raise from the Dead all the Men that ever had a Being, and shall invest the Righteous with Bodies incorruptible, and make the Ungodly, TOGETHER WITH THESE EVIL DEMONS, feel his Vengeance in everlasting Fire.* Tertullian, whose Opinion was that those impure Spirits served themselves by means of the Heathen Gods, whom they caused to be worshipped for that Reason, writes thus: *By a Contagion that walketh in the like Darkness, do Demons and evil Angels blast the Minds of Men, agitating them with Fury and extravagant Uncleaness, and outrageous Lusts mixed with various Errors, the most capital of which Errors is, that having taken Possession of Mens Minds, and secur'd them on every Side from the Power of Truth, they recommend to them the Worship of false Gods, that by the Nidours of those Sacrifices they might procure a Banquet for themselves, the Stench of the Flesh and the Fumes of the Blood being their proper Repast[‡].* In consequence of

* Ἐπει τὸ παλαιὸν δαίμονες φῶλοι, ἐπιφανίας ποιοῦντες, καὶ γυναικας ἰμοιχάσαν, καὶ παῖδας διέθνησαν, καὶ πόλιν τε αὐθιγὰς ἔδειξαν, ὡς καὶ περὶ γλώσσης αἱ λόγοι τὰς ψυχὰς τρεῖς ἐόντες ἰκα-
νον, ἀλλὰ δὲ δὲ (καταπαύμενοι, καὶ μὴ ἐπισαύρουσι δαίμονας) φῶλος,
δεῖς προσωνόμαζον, καὶ ὀνόματι ἑαυτὸν προσεχόμενον, ὅπερ ἔκαστος
αὐτῶν δαίμόνων ἐτίθει. *Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 10. Ed. Thirlb.*
See also p. 13, 33. and Apol. ii. p. 114.

† *Just. Mart. Cohort. p. 87. Ed. Oxon.* See also Mr. Twells's Answer to the Enquiry, p. 12.

‡ Ὅτι καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνιμεῖ, πάντων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ
τῶν μὲν αἰνῶν ἐνδύειν ἀφραστον, τῶν δὲ αἰδίων ἐν αἰδῶσι αἰώνια
META ΤΩΝ ΦΑΥΛΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΩΝ εἰς τὰ αἰώνια πῦρ ὡμῶς.
Just. Mart. Apolog. i. p. 76.

‡ Eadem igitur obscuritate contagionis aspiratio Dæmonum & Angelorum mentis quoque corruptelas agit furoribus & a-
mentiis fœdis, ac sœvis libidinibus cum erroribus variis, quo-

this Opinion you will find *Tertullian* constantly asserting that *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Venus*, and the rest, were but mere Men and Women^a; just as *Athenagoras*, *Clavius*, *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*, and others of the Fathers do, who yet all held that the Gods of the Heathen were unclean Spirits. *Tertullian* held that all Souls went into *Hades*, and affirms that the Demons took pains to oppose that Opinion: Nay, if I be not mistaken^b, we discover the Fallacy of an evil Spirit, when it lurks under the Mask of dead Men, by Experience: while he sometimes under our Exorcisms, affirms himself to have been a Man, and one of our Progenitors sometimes to have been a Gladiator — as being concern'd for nothing more than this, that he may contradict what we preach; and it may not be easily believed, that all Souls go into *Hades*; and this in order to DISTURB MENS FAITH ABOUT THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, and ABOUT THE RESURRECTION. Yet will this Demon, after he hath tried to delude the Company, be so far over-ruled by the Presence of the Divine Grace, as unwillingly to confess himself to be what he really is.

They both agree they were Demons or evil Spirits superior to the Souls of Men, whom the Ancients worshipped under the Names of *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, &c. though they vary somewhat as to the

rum iste potissimus, quos Deos istos captis & circumscriptis hominum mentibus commendat, ut & sibi pabula propria nidoris & sanguinis procuret simulachris & imaginibus oblata. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. xii. See also c. xxi. ad finem. c. xxiii. c. xxvii. initio.

^a *Tertull.* Apolog. c. x, xi, xxviii, xxix.

^b *Tertull.* de Anima, c. lvii. Hanc quoque fallaciam spiritus nequam sub personis defunctorum deliricentis, nisi fallor, etiam rebus probamus; quum in Exorcismis interdum aliquem se ex parentibus hominem suis affirmat, interdum gladiatorem — nihil magis curans, quam hoc excludere quod predicamus, ne facile credamus animas universas ad inferos redigi, &c.

manner how; that is, they had learned from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament^d, that the Gods of the Heathen were *impure Spirits*, but these not informing them at the same Time of the *manner of it*, as to that they were left to themselves. *Tertullian's* Opinion was generally follow'd.

It is evident then, that when *Justin* says, *the Gods of the Heathen are DEMONS*; and *Tertullian*, *You think those are Gods, whom we know to be DEMONS*, they intended to call them *impure Spirits* of a Rank above human; thus neither of them could mean they were only the *Souls of dead Men*. You therefore entirely mistake *Justin Martyr* in that Passage you bring from the first *Apology*, to prove that he calls *Demons the Souls of the deceas'd*^d. The good Father is there going to prove to the Heathen, that Souls live after the Death of the Body, and are capable of Punishment; his Words are^c: *But since all departed Souls continue in Sensation, and everlasting Fire is treasured up for the Unrighteous, let me advise you to look well about you, and lay these Things seriously to Heart; for even Necromancy, and the Inspection of the Entrails of sound Children, and*

^c PSAL. xcvi. 5. 1 COR. x. 20. compar'd with 2 COR. iv. 4. ACTS xxvi. 18,

^d Enquiry, p. 4.

^e 'Αλλ' ἐπεὶ καὶ αἰσθητοὶς πᾶσι γινώσκουσιν μὴ καὶ κόλασις αἰώνια ἀπείκει, μὴ ἀμελήσας τε περὶ τούτων καὶ πιστεῦσαι ὅτι ἀληθῆ τὰ ῥηθέντα ἐστίν; Νεκρομαντεῖαι μὴ γὰρ, καὶ αἱ ἀσφθέρων παιδῶν ἐποπιδείξεις, καὶ ψυχῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κλήσεις, καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι ὡρᾶ τοῖς μάγοις ἐνεργητικοὶ καὶ πάρεδρεσι, καὶ τὰ γινόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν ταῦτα εἰδόντων, περὶ σάτωσαν ὙΜΑΣ, ὅτι καὶ μὴ θάνατον ἐν αἰσθητοῖς εἰσὶν αἱ ψυχαί. καὶ οἱ ψυχῶν ἀποθανόντων λαμβανόμενοι καὶ ἐπιλέμενοι ἄνθρωποι, (ὡς δαιμονιολήτης καὶ μανιομήτης καλεῖται πάντες) καὶ τὰ παρ' ὙΜΙΝ λεγόμενα Μαντεῖα Ἀμφιλόχου, καὶ Δωδώνης, καὶ Πυθῆς, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ τῶν ὑστεροτέρων διδάγματα, Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Πυθαγόρας, Πλάτωνος τε καὶ Σωκράτους, καὶ ὁ παρ' Ὀμήρου βόθρος, καὶ ἡ καθ' ὁδοὺ Ὀδυσσεὺς εἰς τὸ τέτυκτον ἐπίσκεψιν, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ τέτοις ἐπόντων. *Just. Mart. Apolog. i. p. 27. Ed. Thirlb.*

the calling out the Souls of dead Men, and what the Magicians term Dream-Senders and Familiars, and many other Practices of the Dealers in this black Art, may induce YOU to believe that Souls after Death are in a State of Sensation; and moreover those Persons who are seiz'd and thrown down by the Souls of the deceas'd, and who are call'd by all DEMONIACS and mad, and likewise those YOU call the AMPHILOCHIAN, DODONÆAN, PYTHIAN, and other like Oracles; and also the Doctrines of many of your Writers, such as EMPEDOCLES, PYTHAGORAS, PLATO, and SOCRATES, and HOMER's Ditch, and ULYSSES's Visit to the Infernal Shades, and others that say the same. — Can any thing be plainer than that he is here arguing with the Gentiles from their own Practices and Persuasions? And that therefore it was a Belief of theirs, and not of Justin's, that Persons were seiz'd and thrown down by the Souls of the deceas'd? For the Gentiles believ'd at this Time, as you yourself must allow, that the Souls of the deceas'd had Power over the Bodies of the Living. The Words, who are called by ALL, that is, all the Gentiles, Demoniacs and mad, are a Parenthesis, and were added to shew, that by their Expression on the Occasion, they nevertheless owned, that real Demons or impure Spirits did it. His Argument from the Word or Expression, is just such a one as Lactantius uses, when he taxes Apollo with calling himself an impure Spirit, because he calls himself a Demon in his Oracles^f; and as that of Min. Felix, who contends that the Gentiles acknowledged the Unity of the Godhead, from the Phrases so common in their Mouths, God is great, God is true, if God permits^g. Many such like Argu-

^f *Lactant.* lib. i. c. 17.

^g *Min. Felix* c. xviii. and *Tertull.* Apolog. c. xvii.

ments occur in the Writings of the Fathers, and even in *Justin Martyr* himself. *Cohort.* p. 109, 905. *Apolog.* i. p. 82. and indeed the Cast and Manner of the former Part of the first *Apology*, is almost entirely an Argument *ad homines*.

I translate the Word *Δαμονιαστικος*, *Demoniacs*, as Mr. *Twells* and Mr. *Reeves* have done before me; and by *Demoniacs* I mean Persons vexed by Maladies induc'd by *Demons*. As the Author is not here delivering his own, but the Sentiments of the *Gentiles*, to whom his Piece is directed, it is not indeed material to the Point, whether the Word signifies such sort of Persons, as the old *Vates* who were under an Alienation of Mind, raging, and foaming, and full of the God; but I mention the thing, because I observe, that tho' you was once of the same Opinion with us, *Enquiry*, p. 4. 40. yet, forgetting what you had there written, you insist strenuously upon the latter Interpretation in the *Further Enquiry*, p. 49. and I remit you, for my Reasons, to Mr. *Twells's* Answer to the *Further Enquiry*, p. 11.

But say you, "Why is the Change of Expression made, so as to say, *all* *call* those that are seized by the Souls of deceased, *Demoniacs* or *Madmen*, but you call the Oracles of *Dodona*, &c? Why was it not you call in the former Instance, as well as in the latter; if that were *Justin's* Sentiment, that only the *Heathen* understood by Demons the Souls of departed Men, whilst he himself understood something else by that Word^h." Nothing is more common than the Change of Person in Authors of the best Note; but I shall content myself with one Example, which shall be from *Justin* himself, *Whom therefore*

^h Further Enquiry, p. 50.

Jay ye, O Greciansⁱ, are the Masters and Teachers of your Religion? the Poets? You had better never say it to Men that are acquainted with the Writings of the Poets; for THEY know that most ridiculous Theogony of theirs, as it is call'd, which WE learn from the Poems of HOMER, your first and chief Poet.

You misrepresent Tertullian too, when quoting the following Passage from him^k, *They inflict upon Mens Bodies Diseases; and are the peculiar Authors of some Sorts of very grievous Mischances; but as to the Soul, they are the Authors of Mens going suddenly and extraordinarily besides themselves: The Subtlety and Fineness of their make^l, &c.* you apply it to the Demons of the ancient Greeks upon your Hypothesis, that is, to departed Souls; for Tertullian is there speaking of his Demons, which were entirely different from yours.

But Justin Martyr and Tertullian are not the only Authors amongst the Fathers, whom, by endeavouring to interest them in your Cause, you have misrepresented. In the *Further Enquiry*, p. 20. you hook in Origen; after declaring there who the old Gods of the Heathen were, and adding a Word or two of evil Demons, you proceed thus: ‘As this was the ancient Scheme of the Origin of Demons, it may be worth while to observe how Origen has accounted for them. “It is a common “receiv’d Opinion not only amongst Christians “and Jews, but amongst many others, both Greeks

ⁱ *Just. Mart. Cohort.* p. 43.

^k *Enquiry*, p. 11.

^l *Corporibus quidem & valetudines infligunt, & aliquos casus acerbos; animæ vero repentinos & extraordinarios per vim excessus: suppetit illis ad utramque substantiam hominis adeundam subtilitas & tenuitas sua; multum spiritualibus viribus licet ut invisibiles & insensibiles in effectu potius quam in actu suo appareant. Tertull. Apolog. c. xxii.*

“ and *Barbarians*, that the *humane Soul* subsists af-
 “ ter its *D*eparture from the *Body*; and it is rea-
 “ sonable to believe that the *pure Soul*, not borne
 “ down by the heavy *Weight* of *Sin*, is carried
 “ up on high to the *Places* of purer and *etherial*
 “ *Bodies*, having left here below *gross Bodies*,
 “ and the *Pollutions* that belong to them: But
 “ the *wicked Soul* is attracted downwards by its
 “ *Sins* towards the *Earth*; and, not able to aspire
 “ upwards, is borne hitherward, and tossed up and
 “ down: Some of these live about *Sepulchres*,
 “ where one may see the *Apparitions* of *shadowy*
 “ *Souls*; others of them are flying about the *Earth*:
 “ What *Sort* of *Spirits* ought one to think them
 “ to be, which are tied down whole *Ages*, as one
 “ may say, to certain *Houses* or *Places*, either by
 “ *Charms* or by their own *Malice*? Reason tells
 “ us, that they ought to be taken for *evil Spirits*,
 “ who use *Prophecy*, a thing of an indifferent
 “ *Nature* in itself, to deceive *Men*, and to draw
 “ them from *God* and *pure Religion*,” This was
 “ in *Origen’s* Time a *commonly receiv’d Opinion*.”
 One would think by this Account that it was a

ἢ Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔπερ πεπίσσυ ὁ ὡς Χριστιανοῖς καὶ Ἰουδαίοις μόνοις,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ’ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων, ὅτι ζῇ καὶ ὑ-
 πέρχεται μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος χωρισμένη ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ψυχὴ· καὶ
 τῷ λόγῳ παρίσταται, ὅτι ἡ μὲν καθαρὰ, καὶ μὴ βαρυνμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ
 κακίας μολίβδων, μετέωρον φέρεται ἐπὶ τὰς τόπους τοῦ καθαρωτέρων
 καὶ αἰθερίων σωμάτων, κατελιπεῖσα τὰ τῆδε παχέα σώματα καὶ τὰ ἐν
 αὐτοῖς μιάσματα· ἢ ὅ φάσκει, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀμαρτανάδων κατελκομένη
 ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ μὴδ’ ἀναπνεύσαι διωαμένη, τῆδε φέρεται καὶ κυλινδεῖται,
 ἢ μὲν τις ἐπὶ τὰ μνήματα, ἔθρα καὶ ὥρθη σκιοειδῶν ψυχῶν φαντάσ-
 ματα, ἢ δέ τις ἀπαξαπλῶς φερεται τὴν γῆν· ποδαπαρὴ χερὶ νομίζειν ἔτι
 πινύματα, τὰ ὅλα (ἐν ὅτῳ ὀνομάσω) αἰῶνας προσηθέντα, ὥστε
 εἴτε μαλγανείαις τισιν, εἴτε ἄλλοις σφείλεσιν κακίαν, οἰκοδομαῖς καὶ
 τόποις; ὁ λόγος δὲ αἰρεῖ φαυλὴν ἅτλα νομίζειν ἔτι τὰ τοιαῦτα τῇ
 πρῶτης δυνάμει, μέση τυφάνοσιν, εἰς ἀπάτην ἀνθρώπων χρώματα,
 καὶ πρὸς τὸ περιπαῖσαι αὐτὰς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ καθαρώς εἰς αὐτὴν
 σιδήας. Orig. contra Cels. lib. vii. p. 334.

common receiv'd Opinion in *Origen's* Time both amongst *Christians* and *Jews*, that Demons were only the *departed Souls of wicked Men*; but it happens very unfortunately for you, that your Author expressly distinguishes those impure Spirits *the Demons*, from such Souls. He is here speaking of the prophetic *Afflatus* in the *Pythian Oracle*, which he says proceeded from an *evil Demon*; and after one Argument dispatch'd from the manner of Inspiration, he goes on, *Moreover since it is commonly believ'd that Souls exist after Death; and it is reasonable to think that wicked Souls are borne down to the Earth and live about Sepulchres; what manner of Spirits must we imagine them to be which are tied down whole Ages to certain Places? evil no doubt?* The Argument proceeds thus; if such Souls as hover about the Earth are *impure* and *wicked*, the Spirit that gives the Oracle, and is tied down whole Ages to the same Place, must be so. The Souls of Men he calls *ψυχαι*, and these Spirits *πνεύματα*, and what he says about the State and Condition of the Souls, is the *Medium* from whence he argues *a fortiori*, to *impure Spirits*; which therefore must be different from them: And indeed, *Origen* never confounds these two spiritual Beings, but is every where perfectly consistent both with himself and the other Fathers, as to the Nature and Rank of the Demons, namely that they were of an higher Order than the Souls of Men. Thus then the *commonly receiv'd Opinion*, *Origen* speaks of, has nothing to do with the latter Part of the Paragraph, but is restrained to the general Position, that the *human Soul* subsists after its Departure from the Body, which was indeed an universal Doctrine; but as to any thing further, it was far from being currently thought either by *Origen* himself, or by *Christians*,

Jews, Greeks, or Barbarians, that Demons were mere departed Souls.

It remains with me an incontestable Truth, that the *Demons* of the Fathers were universally and in all Cases, an Order of *Spirits* originally superior to the Souls of Men; wherefore in my poor Judgment there will be no manner of Occasion for you to explain to us in a separate Work, what the first *Christians* meant by their *Demoniacs*ⁿ; you may spare yourself that Trouble. You alledge, indeed, that what the Fathers have concerning the manner of Operation of these *impure Spirits* in the Heathen World, their suggesting idolatrous Practices residing in the Images of the Pagan Deities, personating them, and drawing all Adoration to themselves, is mere Hypothesis wanting Proof^o. But what the Fathers have deliver'd upon this Subject must be good as to their own Opinions; and does with the utmost certainty inform us what they intend, when they tax the Gods of the Heathen with being *Demons*, and likewise what *their Demons* were. We are here enquiring what *they* meant by Demons, and it appears upon every Supposition, whether the *Demons* usurped the Names of the Heathen Gods, or *Jupiter, Apollo, &c.* were their own true proper Names; or whether the Fathers were right in imagining they resided in the Images of the Heathen Deities, and delighted in Steams, Odours, and Libations, or not; that they ever regarded them as *impure Spirits*, superior to Man. The Truth of this Case has been already stated, where it was observ'd, that the Notion the Fathers had of the *Demons* was drawn from Scripture, tho' as to the manner of their Operations amongst the *Gentiles* they were left to themselves.

▪ Preface to Enquiry.

° Further Enquiry, p. 25, 27.

To the inspired Writers of the Books of the New Testament, and their best Interpreters, the Fathers, I now add the Jewish Writer *Josephus*, who follow'd the Bible System of Theology, and made use of the LXX Version. I find him not only using the Word *Demon* in a bad Sense, but also for *evil Spirits* originally more than human. *God enabled Solomon*, says he, *to learn the ANTI-DEMONIAC ART, for the Benefit and Health of Mankind; he both composed Incantations whereby Diseases were alleviated, and also left those Forms of Exorcism, by which the Demons being bound, are so expell'd as never to return^p. And again: For Beings that are called DEMONS (these are the Spirits that possess wicked Men) ENTERING into living People, and killing such as have no Help, this Herb presently drives them away, though it be only brought to such as are sick^q. But in this last Passage you think he calls the Souls of wicked Men, Demons; for you render it, these are the Souls of wicked Men^r. But as the Author shews he understood the Demons entered the Bodies of Men, and brought Diseases upon them, I would ask you whether the Jews conceiv'd that the Souls of dead Men had a Power of entering and vexing the Bodies of the Living? Whether *Josephus* ever uses πνεῦμα for the Soul of a Man, and not always ψυχή^s? And how it comes*

^p Παρέχε δ' αὐτῷ [Σολομῶνι] μαθεῖν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν δαιμόνων τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἐπαυδὲς τε (σωτὴρ) αἷς παραγορεῖ τὰ νοσήματα, καὶ τρέπτει ἐξορκῶσιν κατέλειπεν, οἷς ἐνδύματα τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μικρὰ ἐπαυελθεῖν οὐκ ἰδὼκεσι. *Joseph. Antiq. l. viii. c. 2. § 5.*

^q Τὰ γὰρ κατέδρα δαιμόνια, (ταῦτα δὲ πονηρῶν εἰν ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα, τοῖς ὥσιν ἐισδύματα καὶ κλένοισι, τὰς βοηθείας μὴ τυγχάνουσιν, αὐτὴ ταχέως ἐξελαύνει, καὶ πρὸς περὶ μόνον τῆς νοσήσεως. *Joseph. de Bello Jud. l. vii. c. 6 § 3.*

^r Enquiry, p. 5. Further Enquiry, p. 25. 52.

^s Mr. Twells's Answer to the Enquiry, p. 6.

to pass, that he should so contradict a principal Tenet of his own Sect, the *Pharisees*, who held that wicked Souls were kept in everlasting Imprisonment under the Earth^t? 'Till ample Solutions can be given to these Questions, we are bound to interpret this Place thus, *these are the Spirits that possess wicked Men*. And, indeed, it appears plain enough, that the Sense *Josephus* puts upon the Word *Demon*, is the very same with that in the New Testament, namely, *evil Spirit*; for he calls that *Δαιμόνιον*^v, which the LXX Version calls *πνεῦμα πονηρὸν*^x; Terms which are synonymous and reciprocal in the New Testament; whereupon I affirm, that *Josephus's* Demons were *evil Spirits* originally more excellent than us.

The Authors of the LXX Version, the *Hellenists* and *Jews* that made use of it, the inspired Authors of the Books of the New Testament, and the Fathers of the Church all follow the same System of Theology, and they all harmoniously agree in using the Word *Demon* for an *evil Spirit*. They all prove one another, as the Cause and the Effect; and as to the New Testament, the Argument runs, *if the Word DEMON denoted an Evil Spirit amongst the HELLENISTIC JEWS*, it does so in the New Testament; an Argument much more conclusive than that of yours, *DEMON signifies a departed Soul amongst the ancient GREEKS*, therefore it means the same in the New Testament; because, as has been shewn, the New Testament Writers made use only of the Words of one, but both the Theology and the Ideas, as well as the Words of the other.

^t Mr. Twells's Answer to the Enquiry, p. 7.

^v *Joseph. Antiq. lib. vi. c. 10, 13, 14.*

^x 1 KINGS xvi. 14, 16.

Let us now examine your Scripture Arguments, viz. the Objections you start against this universally receiv'd Notion of these controverted Words; and whether they are of Force sufficient to break through this Chain of Argument. The Texts produc'd are ACTS xvii. 18. 1 COR. x. 20, 21. 1 TIM. iv. 1. REV. ix. 20. JAMES ii. 19.

ACTS xvii. 18.

Upon this Text your Comment is, "When St. Paul was at Athens, certain of the Epicureans and Stoics attacked and charged him with being *ἑνῶν δαιμονίων καὶ ἀλλοτρίων θεῶν*, a Setter forth of strange DEMONS or Gods: now he preached unto them Jesus, and that GOD had raised him from the dead, & 31. and therefore the Word Demon here is used for the Soul of one deceased, or of a Man raised from the dead." The Words of St. Luke are, *Other some, he seemeth to be a Setter forth of strange Gods: because he preached unto them Jesus and THE RESURRECTION; that is, the Resurrection of Mankind in general, as appears from & 31, 32. He hath appointed a Day in the which he will judge THE WORLD in Righteousness, by that Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given Assurance unto all Men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. And when they heard of THE RESURRECTION from the dead, some mocked, &c.* See also chap. iv. 2. But be this as it will, whose Words are these, and out of whose Mouths do they come? The Epicureans and Stoics, say you; then, say I, this Text is nothing to the Purpose; for it is not the Notion of the ancient Heathen you are here seeking after, but that which St. Luke had of the Word *Demon*. — You would be hard

put to it to prove that the *Demons* of those Philo-
sophers were departed Souls; *Celsus* the *Epicurean*
never applies the Word in that Sense*, and Mr.
Mede shall be my Voucher for the *Stoics*†. In
short, the most you can make of this Text, is
strange Gods in the Heathen Notion, who were far
from thinking their Deities the Souls of mere dead
Men, as has been amply argued above; but if they
did, it would signify nothing in this Case.

I COR. X. 20, 21.

20. *Those things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sa-
crifice to Demons and not to God: and I would not
that ye should have Fellowship with Demons.*

21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the
Cup of Demons; ye cannot be Partakers of the
Table of the Lord, and of the Table of Demons.*

You will agree that the *Demons* here are the
Heathen Gods, the Deities to whom the *Gentiles*
sacrificed. How then does this Text serve you?
You are about to prove that *Demon* in the *Acts*,
the *Epistles*, and *Revelations* means a departed Soul,
and you cite these Words where the Gods of the
Heathen are called *Demons*. But does not the Que-
stion still recur, whether the ancient *Greeks* regar-
ded their Deities as *departed Souls*? And then whe-
ther, supposing they did, the same precise Mean-
ing is affixed to the Word in the Scriptures as is
in them? You must give us further Satisfaction on
both these Heads before we shall part with this
Text to you: It appears to us as yet, that when
the Scriptures say the Gods of the Heathen were
Demons, they mean to call them *evil Spirits* of a
Rank above departed Souls. But you lay Stress

* See before, p. 11. † *Mede's Works*, p. 627.

on St. Paul's saying, *that an Idol is nothing*; for you write, "The Apostle had a little before observed, chap. viii. 4, 5, 6. *That an Idol is nothing in the World; and that there is no OTHER GOD but one. For though there be that are CALLED GODS, whether in Heaven or in Earth, as there be Gods many and Lords many, yet to us there is but one GOD the Father — and the Lord JESUS CHRIST.* Demons therefore were called *Æol*, Gods and Lords; and to partake of the Sacrifices offered to them, was to be in *Friendship* with them. To eat therefore at *Venus's* Table, the principal Goddess of *Corinth*, was to own her as having Dominion over them: Not to own a Devil to have such Power, which would be owning a Truth, if evil Spirits have such Power over us; but owning *Venus* to have a Power, which she has not." St. Paul is there speaking of eating Things offered unto Idols, and he says; *We, the Disciples and Followers of Jesus Christ, know, that an Idol is nothing in the World; that is, no proper Object of divine Worship; no God, for there is no other God but one; just as GAL. iv. 8. he says, then when ye knew not God, ye did Service unto them WHICH BY NATURE ARE NO GODS.* This is the natural Interpretation of this Text, and is such an one as you cannot except against, for if the Idols or Gods of the Heathen were departed Souls, according to your Scheme they still were *something*; and you are obliged to understand the Apostle, when he admits an Idol to be *Nothing*, 1 COR. x. 19. as if he had said, *it is no true God*; for you make him say, "I agree^c that an Idol is nothing; but remember that those things which the *Gentiles* sacrifice, they sacrifice

^b Further Enquiry, p. 44.

^c *Ibid.* p. 43.

“to what they think to be something: They do
 “it to *Venus, Apollo*, and a thousand other Be-
 “ings, whom they look upon as Gods, and who
 “are properly *Demons* ;” that is, whom they look
 upon as true Gods, but are not so.

I TIM. iv. 1.

*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter
 Times some shall depart from the Faith, giving
 heed to seducing Spirits and Doctrines of Demons.*

You chuse to adhere to the Interpretation Mr. *Mede* has given us of this Text; who understands it as containing a Prophecy fulfilled in the worshipping of Saints now practised in the Church of *Rome*; by *Doctrines of Demons* being meant *Doctrines concerning Demons*. This great Author, it must be confessed, has supported his Opinion with great Learning and much Ingenuity, but I cannot be of your Opinion that he has brought the Point to Demonstration^d; for, as Dr. *Whitby* observes, to whom I refer you as my Advocate, this Passage must relate to the Apostolic Age; for at § 6. the Apostle exhorts *Timothy to put the Brethren in Remembrance of these Things*, which could not be, if it was a Prediction relating to After-Times. In the next Chap, § 15. he says, *Some are already turned aside after Satan*; and see 2 TIM. iv. 3, 4. These *seducing Spirits* were therefore *Spirits of Error*, 1 JOH. iv. 6, and the *Doctrines of Demons* the Suggestions of those evil Spirits.

^d Further Enquiry, p. 46.

REV. IX. 20.

And the rest of the Men that were not killed by these Plagues, yet repented not of the Works of their Hands, that they should not worship DEVILS, Δαιμόνια, and Idols of Gold, and Silver, and Brass, and Stone, and of Wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk.

Hereupon you write, “ Look * for the Completion of this Prophecy in the *Western World*, in *Italy*, and the Parts adjacent. — Did ever any one charge the *Christian World* with the Worship of *Devils*? or where are any *evil Spirits*, made the Objects of Adoration amongst the Followers of *Jesus*? *Demons*, indeed, in the true and native Sense of the Word, have been, and are worshipped to this Day; but why the Charge of worshipping the *Devil*, detestably corrupt as some Part of the Christian Church is, should be said, I know not.”

You take it for granted that this Prophecy concerns the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, particularly in the Article of Saint-Worship; but *Grotius* and *Hammond* interpret it of the Heathen Idolatry, and refer it to the *Jews* and their Associates before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*. I think it very plain, let the Passage relate to what it will, that the Terms belong to the ancient Idolatry, see above, p. 54. and by the common Rule of Interpretation, the Word Δαιμόνιον must here mean, what it does in the other Places, where it is us'd of the Heathen Idols. It is not unusual for Prophecies to carry a double Meaning, one *presently*, and another more *remotely* fulfilled, or if you

* Further Enquiry, p. 46.

will, for the Words and Expressions of Prophets to admit a twofold Interpretation. Supposing then the Words should ultimately respect the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, this will not hinder, but *Demons* here may be *evil Spirits*, consistently with the other Scriptures; but if the Scriptural Sense of that Word be *evil Spirits*, as has been largely and clearly prov'd, these *Demons* must be *evil Spirits*, for the Apostle must needs use, let him be speaking of what he will, the Scriptural Language of the Time. But what if the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* should be a worshipping of *evil Spirits*? You ask indeed, "Did ever any one charge the Christian World with the Worship of Devils?" or where are any *evil Spirits* made the Objects of Adoration amongst the Followers of *Jesus*? To which I answer, a direct worshipping of *evil Spirits*, as such, is not charged upon the Church of *Rome*; but should it be said, that the Devil with the rest of the Apostate Spirits are at the same Work now they were formerly; and that as before they so successfully derived the proper Worship of the one true God upon themselves, by substituting the several Deities of the ancient Pagans, they are still labouring to procure the like Adoration of themselves by the Advancement of *Romish* Saints, I don't know how either you, or the Sons of that Church could disprove it^f; Should this be the Case, the *Romanists* are worshipping *Demons* in the same Sense the Pagans did, with whom that corrupt Church symbolizes but too much in other Articles besides this^g; and the *Demons* in the Text will mean, upon your own Ap-

^f See Mr. Mede's Works, p. 635, 636.

^g Dr. Middleton's Letter from Rome, and the several Authors refer'd to by Fabricius in *Bibliographia Antiq.* p. 107, 108.

plication of the Prophecy, *evil Spirits*, and the Church of *Rome* will stand justly chargeable with worshipping *Demons* virtually and effectually, though not formally or directly.

JAMES ii. 19.

Thou believest that there is one God, thou dost well; the Devils also believe and tremble.

This Text, you own, “ seems to be clear for a “ Sense of the Word *Δαιμόνια* for *evil Spirits* ^h; ” and you suppose it was from this Text that the Fathers said those Things concerning Devils which occur so frequently in their Writingsⁱ. This Observation, the Merits of which have been before examined^k, one would think might have convinc’d you, that the obvious and natural Sense was the true one: But you nevertheless adventure to say^l: “ it may be interpreted, consistently with other “ Places of Scripture, of *departed Beings*; and “ St. James’s reasoning will be very strict and just “ taken in that Sense: ” The consistent Meaning of this Text is *evil Spirits*: for the Writers of the New Testament, the Greek Translators of the Old, with the whole Stream of primitive Antiquity, are remarkably consentient in this Sense, and as adverse to yours; and the Reasoning, which you think will be very strict and just when taken in your Sense, will run thus: *If thou, who art a Man, ONLY BELIEVEST that there is one God, and dost not bring forth the Fruits of Faith, thou dost no more than what DEPARTED MEN do, who believe and tremble. I say no more.*

^h Further Enquiry, p. 47.

ⁱ *Ibid.*

^k *Supra*, p. 53.

^l Further Enquiry, p. 48.

I have dispatch'd your Objections, and must think them all capable of receiving satisfactory Solutions upon the literal receiv'd Scheme; I desire you would consider what has been alledg'd. There is not above one or two that will bear any Dispute; and as we are always bound to interpret particular Texts by the Tenor of the whole, the Texts you produce can admit of no other Explanation than what is agreeable to the other Scriptures. The consistent Scriptural Meaning of the Word *Demon*, has been very fully argued and laid down, and it is submitted to you, whether the objected Texts have not been expounded rationally and in a manner entirely consonant therewith.

But if the Word *Demon* in the New Testament means an *evil Spirit*, and the Heathen Gods are therein called *Demons*, 1 COR. x. 20. Ps. xcvi. 5. then the whole of the Enquiry must fall to the Ground, even tho' that Word should signify a *departed Soul* amongst the ancient *Greeks*. But what must the World think, if the Word imported no such thing amongst them? that the Hypothesis of the Enquirer, is a whimsical Conceit?

It is insisted then, that the Words of St. *John*, *He hath a Devil and is mad*, JOH. x. 20. which Mr. *Mede* and you so much rely upon^m, do not import that *to have a Devil* and *to be mad* is the same thing, but that Madness is there specify'd in order to shew of what Nature the *Jews* took the Possession to be. Possessions by evil Spirits discover'd themselves divers Ways, often by the Symptoms of Madness, and this they look'd upon to be of that Sort: But it no more follows, that because Madness is a natural Distemper, therefore

^m Mr. *Mede's* Discourse on JOH. x. 20. Enquiry, p. 36, 38.

this and many other Demoniactal Cases were such, than that Leprosyⁿ and Blindness^o could not be inflicted by any extraordinary supernatural means, because they were common Disorders.

It is insisted again, that tho' *departed Souls* could not inflict Diseases, yet *Demons* might; and therefore your Citations from *Hippocrates* and *Aretæus*^p, and all your Ratiocinations upon the *Cerriti* and *Larvati* of the *Romans*^q, must pass for nothing. The Ancients might run into an Extreme, imputing thro' Ignorance and Fear, more Disorders to invisible Agents, than really came from them; but still as their Gods were *Demons*, who as we are assur'd from the best Authority in the World, both could and did bring Diseases upon Men, I make no Question but they had many true *Demoniactal* Cases amongst them.

These Assertions are not built upon a precarious Hypothesis, but are founded in the consistent Doctrine of the Old and New Testament; a Doctrine universally receiv'd from the Beginning down to the present Times, and that without any manner of Opposition or Controul, 'till within these few Years, and then from some single Pens, mostly of a bad Note^r. And, indeed, I do not perceive how it can be attack'd to any Purpose, unless by turning *Sadducee*, and denying the Existence of evil Spirits, or by proving it to be impossible that they should bring Diseases upon Mankind, which I am persuaded you will hardly attempt^s.

ⁿ 2 KINGS v. 27.

^o ACTS xiii. 11.

^p Enquiry, p. 7, *seq.*

^q Enquiry, p. 14. *seq.* Further Enquiry, p. 69. *seq.*

^r See Mr. *Hutchinson's* Sermon, p. 30.

^s Further Enquiry, p. 48.

But

But it seems, you have a Difficulty in relation to the General Doctrine; for you ask, "How comes it to pass that we read of so many Persons, *just at the particular Time* of our Saviour's Ministry, under the Power of Devils?" This Difficulty was the Motive that induc'd you to make the Enquiry, and therefore, if you please, we will briefly consider, for a Conclusion to this long Epistle, how far any Scruple of this Sort, could be sufficient warrant for you to attempt a Method of Interpretation so contrary to the Sense of all Antiquity, both Sacred and Profane.

The *Mosaic* and *Christian* Dispensations must always be deemed by *Christians* the Basis of all true Theology. It is from them we must draw all the assured well-grounded Knowledge we can have of the immaterial World, purely such; the Objects whereof are of that Sort, as can never otherwise than imperfectly be the Subjects of human Reason, for want of Ideas and Materials to work upon, and of Capacity to receive them. These high Things are the peculiar Burthen of Revelation; which when it is once made, and we firmly believe it to be the very Word of God, it is enough for us, that we are sure such and such Truths are therein delivered, and that they are not *contrary* to our Reason. We receive such Truths as these upon the Credit and Authority of the Revealer; we receive them, even tho' they are attended with some Difficulties, because it is impossible from the Nature of them, that they should be adequately comprehended by such limited Intelligences as we are. Thus it is that we embrace the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Incarnation of the Son of God, altho' we do not pretend to understand those

Mysteries fully at present, neither are able, as daily Experience shews, to answer every puzzling Question, which fond and perverse Mortals are pleased to ask, to their Satisfaction. Such Truths as these, are consistent with Difficulties; and accordingly in Demonology, it may be very difficult to say, why God should create that evil Being the *Devil*, who, he could not but foresee, would prove so great an Adversary, and work so much Mischief to Mankind. This very thing has given Occasion to many Disputes; and it is very possible, that should you be interrogated concerning this Matter, by such another Enquirer as yourself, you might be put to it to assign such Reasons as should convince him, tho' at the same Time you firmly and rationally believe yourself, both the Existence of that Prince of Darkness, and that he is a Creature of God's Hand. Why then should you wonder to find yourself somewhat puzzled for a Reason, why the same God permitted so much Power to *unclean Spirits*, at the Time of our Saviour's Incarnation? Or why Possessions were then more frequent than usual? We are taught in Scripture that the Gods of the Heathen were *Demons*, but the same Scriptures, not condescending to tell us in what Manner the Demons operated and imposed upon the Heathen in those dark Ages of Superstition, we find the Fathers differing upon this Point, even in the second Century^v. The Thing then may be true, there might be more Demoniacs then, than either before or after, notwithstanding any Difficulties you may be pressed with in giving Reasons for it: And I humbly conceive, that tho' a modest Enquirer may propose a Question of this Sort, and learned Men are at Li-

^v See before, p. 59.

berty to offer their Solutions, and will think themselves bound so to do, yet should they not always succeed in their Endeavours, so as to please the Demander perfectly, the deliver'd Truth would neither suffer any Detriment by the Miscarriage, nor the Demander in believing it nevertheless; however he certainly might very well dispense with himself from flying in the Face of all Antiquity, and from venting a chimerical Hypothesis, merely because he was not satisfied: But should he determine to do otherwise, his Proceeding would then be just as unreasonable, as it would be presumptuous for him to make himself a Judge of the Sense of any *Greek Word* now, in Opposition to all them who liv'd at the Time when the Word was in use, and were *Greeks* either by Nation, or Language, or both.

It may be of use to remark here, that at this time of day, Difficulties do even attend some natural Facts related in Scripture, which yet considerate Men will believe nevertheless. The Leprosy, for Instance, is represented there, as a Distemper much more frequent than it is now, even in that Clime. For three or four of these last Centuries I suppose this Distemper and the *Lues Venerea* may have been confounded; that it was so in this Kingdom has been learnedly and solidly prov'd by an ingenious Writer^x; the Confusion of the two Maladies, and their passing under one common Name, the Leprosy, would greatly increase the Number of Lepers for the Time, no doubt; but in the more early Ages, before the *Lues Venerea* came into the World, this could not be the Case. Now it is possible for Gentlemen that shall please to set their Wits to work, to ask many Questions, and

^x Mr. Becket in the Philosophical Transactions, Part iii. p. 149. & *alibi*.

to form various Conjectures concerning the Riseness of the Leprosy amongst the Ancients, and perhaps the ablest Advocates of Revelation might be troubled to return such Answers as they should think full; but yet I apprehend the Fact would not be the less true for that Reason. As the *Lues Venerea* has but lately started up, it is reasonable to think, there were Distempers formerly, which are lost now; the Disappearance of any Distemper now, would therefore be no conclusive Argument against the Reality of its Existence formerly; much less would the present Rareness of any Disorder be Proof against the former Frequency of it. Could *Hippocrates* or *Galen* be by any means inform'd by Witnesses of Ability and Integrity, how Matters are now with us in relation to the Venereal Distemper, and should take it into their Heads to discredit it, solely because they had never heard of such a thing, or could not account for it; we should certainly think them very perverse Creatures. But to return.

You do not deny, for your Part, but there are Difficulties on your Side of the Question^y. Now these, as many as there are of them, will bear very hard upon you, because as a Difficulty on the other Side afforded you the Pretence of writing against the receiv'd Interpretation, every thing on your Part ought to be perfectly clear and free from Incumbrance. It is not my Design to enumerate every particular Difficulty in your Scheme, neither is there any Occasion for it after what has been said by Mr. *Twells*. I shall content myself with observing upon the Enquiry in general, that an unprejudic'd Person, had you advis'd with any such, must have seen two or three unfurmoutable

^y Enquiry, p. 74. Further Enquiry, p. 108.

Difficulties in it. The First, the establishing your new Sense of the Word *Demon* amongst the Ancient *Greeks*. The Second, the introducing afterwards any classical Sense of that Word into the New Testament. And the Third, the opposing the Voice of the whole *Christian* Church for so many Ages. Attentive Readers will be apt to think it not less strange, that the whole *Christian* Church from the Beginning down to this present Time, should be ignorant of the true Meaning of the Word *Demon*, tho' so great a Part of it was *Greek*, than that now you are not able to satisfy yourself why there were so many *Demoniacs* during our Saviour's Ministration. They will think the Goodness of God as much engaged, to preserve his Church, which had the Promise of *being led into all Truth*, from falling instantly into invincible Error, as to restrain at that Time the Power of those unclean Spirits who delight in doing Mischief.

And thus considering duly the Nature of the Thing, namely, that the whole Doctrine of Angels both good and bad, so far as we can assuredly rest upon it, is altogether Matter of Revelation; together with the Strength of Evidence, and the certain uniform manner in which the receiv'd Notion of *Demoniacs* hath been delivered down to us; to have behav'd like a rational sedate Agent in this Affair, you ought to have forbore this wild Attempt, notwithstanding the Difficulty you found in accounting for the great Number of *Demoniacs* in our Saviour's Time. However, as this Objection appear'd so considerable to your Imagination, as to make you think it worth while to trouble the World with it, it is fit you should be made easy, if possible, and therefore

fore I shall willingly use my Endeavours to remove all Scruple from your Mind.

After that too successful Attempt, which that old Serpent the *Devil* made upon our first Parents, his Power was continually gaining Ground in the World; the restless Temper of the Fiend would prompt him to practise every Art, and the Progress of Idolatry shews he did. 'Tis rational to suppose, that as his Power was at its greatest Height, at the Time when our Blessed Saviour appear'd, he would then exert himself the most visibly and forcibly; he was then to receive a Downfal, and would not fail both to resist to the utmost, and to work all the Mischief he possibly could. It is evident he did then bestir himself in an extraordinary manner from the Attempts he made upon our Blessed Saviour and the Apostles. This now may be thought a good Reason why there were more Persons under the Power of Demons at that Time than any other. But say you, "We rarely meet with *Demoniacal* Cases amongst Men, either *before* or *after* the Times of *Jesus Christ*:" Not so often as then, for the Reason given; but however there were many such both *before* and *after*. The Power of the Devil was not totally crush'd at once, but it ceased by Degrees, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Writings of the primitive Fathers, who frequently appeal to the Power of exorcising Demons, especially the *Apologists*^b: And as to the Ante-Gospel Times, the Scriptures of the New Testament, as Mr. *Mede* observes^c, do not represent Possessions as a *strange* or *extraordinary* Thing among the *Jews*, and we have no Reason to ima-

^a Enquiry, p. 1.

^b *Justin. Mart. Theoph. Antioch. Tertull. Min. Felix. Cyprian.*

^c *Mr. Mede's Discourse on John. x. 20.*

gine the *Gentiles* were more exempted from the Oppression of the Devil, than them. MAT. viii. 28. xv. 22.

This is my Resolution of your Difficulty in few Words; whether it will prove to your Satisfaction or not, I cannot tell; but it is such as I am contented with myself, and perhaps may have its Weight with other not more unreasonable Men.

Your humble Servant,

SAM. PEGGE.

F I N I S.



Printed by J. Smith, at the New-England-Shop, in the City of London.

